DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 740 24 SP 004 258

AUTHOR	Walthew, John K.
TITLE	A Public School Teacher as an Educational Change Agent. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-B-071
PUB DATE	Aug 70
GRANT	OEG-2-9-400071-1041
NOTE	155p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.85
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes, *Change Agents, *Educational Innovation, *Grants, Information Dissemination, Parent Reaction, *Public School Teachers, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

The New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program, which gave minigrants (up to $1,000) to classroom teachers to enable them to implement their innovative ideas, was examined by studying the group of teachers receiving minigrants in 1968-69, the first year of the program. Questionnaires sent to recipients and to administrators knowledgeable about the recipients' teaching sought information about the following: 1) selected demographic and professional characteristics of recipients, together with characteristics of the origin and development of their projects; 2) effects of the recipients' projects on themselves and on students, other teachers, administrators, parents, and school board members; 3) means of disseminating the results of projects. Data received from 86 of the 108 minigrant recipients indicated that the major effect was on the recipients themselves in the form of professional satisfaction in being able to teach in ways which resulted in important behavioral changes in pupils. External effects, such as increased acceptance of innovative ideas by administrators and others, were moderate. The study also pinpointed a need for improved dissemination of information on the projects. (Appendixes contain the questionnaires sent to teachers and administrators and brief descriptions of the 1968-69 projects.) (RT)

ED0 42740

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-B-071

Grant No. OEG-2-9-400071-1041

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER AS AN ~~EXCEPTIONAL~~ EDUCATIONAL CHANGE AGENT

John K. Walthew
New Jersey State Department of Education
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

August 1970

SP004258

U.S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments........ vi

Summary........ vii

Chapter I - Introduction........ 1

Background of the Study........ 1

Objectives........ 3

Chapter II - Methods........ 4

Data-Gathering Instruments........ 4

Data Collection........ 5

Data Processing........ 6

Chapter III - Analysis and Findings........ 7

Introduction........ 7

Characteristics of Minigrant Recipients........ 7

Origin and Development of the Minigrant Projects........ 19

Effects of the Minigrant Projects........ 31

Dissemination of Information about Minigrant Projects........ 54

Chapter IV - Conclusions and Recommendations........ 57

Conclusions........ 57

Recommendations........ 62

Appendix 1 - Materials Used in the Collection of Data........ 65

Appendix 2 - Brief Descriptions of the Innovative Projects of the 1968-69 Minigrant Recipients Participating in the Study........ 135

LIST OF CHARTS AND TABLES

Chart		Page
1	A Comparison of the 1968-69 Minigrant Recipients with Samples of Teachers from New Jersey and the United States on Selected Demographic and Professional Characteristics	15
Table		
1	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Sex	7
2	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Age	8
3	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Sex and Age	8
4	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Years Taught in School Districts at the Time Grants Were Awarded	9
5	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Total Years Teaching Experience in 1968-69	9
6	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Level of Higher Education	10
7	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by School Level	11
8	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Sex and School Level	12
9	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Certification and Teacher Status	12
10	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Membership in Teacher Organizations	13
11	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Number of Professional Books Read in 1967-68	13
12	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Professional Status Anticipated in 1975	14
13	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Climate for Classroom Innovation Stimulated by Administrators	16

Table		Page
14	Number of Recipients by Type and Frequency of Innovation Prior to Applying for Minigrants	16
15	Mean Rankings of Minigrant Recipients' Interest in Selected Teaching Tasks	18
16	Mean Rankings of Minigrant Recipients' Use of Models for Guiding Teaching	19
17	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Type of Innovation Perceived by Recipients	20
18	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Perception of Type of Innovating Done by Other Teachers in Their Buildings	20
19	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Source of Ideas for Projects	21
20	Mean Rankings of Interests Influencing the Development of Minigrant Recipients' Projects	22
21	Number and Percentage of Recipients by Source of Help in Deciding to Apply for a Minigrant	23
22	Mean Rankings of Reasons Recipients Applied for Minigrants	24
23	Number and Percentage of Recipients by Individual Consulted in Preparing Minigrant Proposals	25
24	Number of Reports of Recipients by Intensity of Consultation in Preparing Minigrant Proposals	26
25	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Categories of Individuals Aware of the Implementation of the Projects	27
26	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Type and Source of Feelings of Others Perceived by Recipients	28
27	Number and Percentage of Recipients Reporting Feelings of Others Toward Minigrants by Type and Source of Feelings	30
28	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Direct and Indirect Focus on Students	31

Table		Page
29	Number of Minigrant Projects by Number of Students Affected and Direct or Indirect Focus on Students	32
30	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Time at Which Changes in Pupils Occur	32
31	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by the Nature of Pupil Changes Resulting from the Projects	33
32	Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Effects of Projects on Pupils' Learning Rates	34
33	Number of Minigrant Projects by Category of Teacher and Number of Teachers Using the Projects	34
34	Number of Minigrant Projects by Category of Teacher Using the Project and Evaluation of the Use	36
35	Number of Minigrant Projects by Degree of Influence on Teacher Innovation and Category of Teacher	38
36	Number of Recipients Reporting Innovation Prior to Minigrants by Category of Teacher and Extent of Innovation	39
37	Number of Projects by Degree of Influence on Minigrant Applications and Category of Teacher	40
38	Number of Recipients Reporting Interest in Applying for Minigrants Prior to Recipients' Minigrants by Category of Teacher and Amount of Interest	41
39	Number of Projects by Degree of Influence on Administrative Encouragement of Teacher Innovation and Category of Administrator	43
40	Number of Recipients Reporting Administrative Encouragement of Teacher Innovation Prior to Minigrants by Category of Administrator and Extent of Encouragement	44
41	Number of Projects by Degree of Administrative Encouragement of Minigrant Applications and Category of Administrator	45

Table Page

42 Number of Recipients Reporting Administrative Encouragement of Minigrant Applications Prior to Recipients' Minigrants by Category of Administrator and Extent of Encouragement 46

43 Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by the Type of Effect on School Boards 47

44 Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by the Type of Effect on Parents 48

45 Number of Recipients Reporting Changes in Professional Behavior After Obtaining Minigrants by Type of Professional Behavior and Degree of Change 50

46 Number of Recipients by Type of Professional Behavior and Degree of Change Reported by Administrators 52

47 Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Means of Communication of Results to Teachers 55

48 Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Means of Communication of Results to Clients and Category of Client 56

Acknowledgments

The study relied heavily on the cooperation of the group of teachers receiving minigrants under the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program. The 86 teachers who completed lengthy questionnaires about themselves and their minigrant projects made the study possible. Any contributions to knowledge resulting from the study must be imputed directly to the ability and willingness of these 86 minigrant recipients to describe what occurred before, during, and after the implementation of their innovative projects.

The study was also aided by the 45 administrators who took time from their busy schedules to complete questionnaires about the minigrant projects conducted by teachers in their schools. The data furnished by these administrators formed a useful supplement to the information provided by the minigrant recipients.

Special appreciation is extended to the teachers receiving minigrants and the administrators in the schools visited by the investigator during different phases of the study. The friendly hospitality shown by the personnel of these schools made the visits pleasant occasions. Administrators were particularly helpful in making the necessary arrangements to assure teacher-recipients ample time to discuss their minigrant projects with the investigator; teachers were helpful in arranging for the investigator to speak with students whereever possible.

The Co-Directors of the study, Dr. William M. Phillips, Jr., Director of the Office of Research in the New Jersey State Department of Education, and Dr. Thomas H. Adams, Professor of Elementary Education at Trenton State College, were constantly available to give intelligent counsel and assistance at all stages of the study.

Finally, it is necessary to recognize the competent and invaluable help given by those involved in preparing the data-collecting instruments and the report of the study, as well as in processing the data collected in the study.

Summary

The New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program, by making funds available in the form of minigrants to classroom teachers to enable them to implement their innovative ideas, represents a strategy for educational change, with the teachers receiving the minigrants becoming agents for any changes which occur. This strategy for educational change was examined by studying the group of teachers receiving minigrants in 1968-69, the first year of the Teacher Innovation Program. More specifically, the study sought information about the following in connection with the 1968-69 minigrant recipients: (1) selected demographic and professional characteristics of the recipients, together with characteristics of the origin and development of their projects; (2) effects of the recipients' projects on themselves and others, including students, teachers and administrators, and clients (parents and school board members); and (3) means of disseminating the results of projects.

The minigrant recipients were the principal source of information in the study. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from recipients. Data from recipients were supplemented by a questionnaire for administrators knowledgeable about the recipients' teaching, and by visits to 20 randomly-selected projects. Usable questionnaires were available for 86 of the 108 teachers receiving minigrants in 1968-69; these 86 recipients were the subjects of the study. Forty-five administrators returned usable questionnaires.

Analysis of the questionnaire data reveled the group of minigrant recipients to be evenly balanced between men and women teachers and between elementary school and junior school-high school teachers. The average recipient was in his late thirties; was an experienced, certificated, tenured teacher possessing certain traditional professional attributes, which included belonging to professional organizations and reading professionally; had actively pursued advanced higher education; and aspired to a more responsible position in public school work. Minigrant recipients saw themselves as innovative teachers relying most on themselves for teaching ideas and least on parental desires and the content of teacher education courses, and preferring the more familiar teaching tasks of presenting content and selecting objectives over such tasks as guiding pupils' social-emotional behavior and evaluating procedures and pupils.

Recipients relied on themselves for the ideas for their projects, but applied for minigrants with the help of building and/or central office administrators who also assisted recipients in writing the proposals. Recipients originated their projects to change pupils' behavior, while they applied for minigrants not only because the projects were important but because the grants represented a way to acquire the materials or equipment needed to implement the projects.

The recipients' projects had external and internal effects. The external effects involved students, professionals (teachers and administrators), and clients (parents and school board members). The internal effects concerned the recipient himself.

The effects on students were difficult to determine, since learning is an individual matter. Most of the projects involved teaching students, with many of these concerned with the acquisition of knowledge and/or skills. The projects resulted in important behavioral changes in some pupils and insignificant or superficial changes in others.

The projects had only moderate effects on clients of the recipients' schools. Some recipients reported that parents desired to see their projects continued; a few indicated that school boards had decided to give financial support to continue their projects and/or initiate projects devised by other teachers.

Similarly, the projects had moderate effects on professionals in schools. There was indication from about half of the group of recipients that teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings were using aspects of the projects. Some recipients reported an increase in teachers' attempts at trying new ideas in their classrooms, as well as in interest in applying for minigrants, following the projects. Some recipients also reported an increase by building administrators in encouraging teachers to innovate in the classroom and to apply for minigrants. However, these effects of the projects on other professionals were for the most part localized in recipients' school buildings.

The limited effects of the minigrant projects on professionals and to some extent on parents and school board members might be ascribed to the means by which information about the projects was disseminated. The results of projects were communicated to teachers chiefly in informal conversations with recipients or through oral exchanges with building administrators. The newspaper article was the only form of written communication receiving substantial mention by recipients as a means for conveying information about the projects.

The most significant effects of the minigrant projects seemed focused inward on the recipients themselves. The minigrants enabled many recipients to improve their professional services to students through the acquisition of materials or equipment, or through the provision of activities, which objectified the innovative ideas of the projects. A few teachers, for whom the internal effects were much deeper, gained personal fulfillment through being able to teach in ways which resulted in important behavioral changes in pupils.

The New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program may require a longer period of existence and certain modifications before its potential as a strategy for educational change can be fully realized. Continued study of the Program is warranted, especially in the direction of investigating personality and environmental dimensions essential to creative innovation in public schools.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background of the Study

Capability for change is a sine qua non for any system of education in the contemporary world. Concern about planning for change in education in the United States is nowhere more evident than in events such as the recent Eight-State Project, Designing Education for the Future. This project comprised three conferences held in 1966-67 to infer society as it may be in 1980, in order to determine needed changes in education and the means for realizing these changes.

Concerned citizens continually stress the need for those exercising stewardship over the nation's schools to make these schools responsive to the conditions of our society. One undisputable fact about American society, and, indeed, about almost every other society in the world, is that it is in constant and rapid flux. This state of flux makes it imperative that schools envision not only new goals and suitable means for attaining these goals, but also more effective ways for reaching objectives which transcend time. Schools must modify what they do and how they do it, if the institution of formal education is to survive in any useful form.

Unfortunately, change in public education has tended to be a "happening" rather than a planned outcome. Change as a "happening" just occurs. The mere need for the Eight-State Project, Designing Education for the Future, mentioned previously is mute evidence of the current status of change in education. Additional dramatic evidence for the lack of planning for change in education is no further than the nearest school building under construction.

Moreover, in education, change has often received greater attention as a need concept than it has as a set of purposely devised strategies whose effectiveness is demonstrated. The "need for change" is a topic explored at length in courses comprising pre-service and co-service college programs of teacher preparation. The topic receives additional emphasis in programs intended to prepare individuals for school leadership positions, since it is administrators who are expected to know more about changes needed in schools and to assume responsibility for accomplishing any which seem desirable (and feasible). However, college and university departments of education do not by design prepare change agents for the public schools.

The Eight-State Project is a hopeful sign that educational change is at last receiving more careful theoretical attention. Robert Chin,[1] in a paper presented at the third conference on Designing Education for the Future, suggests three general change strategies operating in social institutions, including educational institutions: (1) empirical-rational approaches; based on reason and utiliterianism, which involve the use of research, development, diffusion, and adoption processes to build a firm knowledge and procedural substructure for change; (2) normative-reeducative approaches; based on attitude change, which may occur through identification with change agents, for example, or of equal importance, which may occur through group membership; (3) power approaches; based on compliance with the demands of those in position to coerce, remunerate, or exert leadership skill. It should be remembered that these theoretical formulations are based on changes as they presently occur in institutions.

---

[1] Robert Chin. "Basic Strategies and Procedures in Effecting Change," Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education, (New York: Citation Press, 1967.) pp. 43-53.

Of the three kinds of change strategies adumbrated by Chin, the one most in evidence in the schools is the power approach. School personnel are hierarchically ordered, with leadership functions vested in a relatively small administrative cadre at the top of the hierarchy. Consequently, the path of change extends from administrators, who make the basic decisions, to teachers, whose cooperation must be enlisted if the changes are to be effected successfully.

In 1968, the Teacher Innovation Program was inaugurated by the New Jersey State Department of Education. This Program, which was developed through the cooperation of the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) and the Department of Education, awards small grants (minigrants, as they are more popularly known) to teachers who submit proposals describing innovative projects they wish to implement. The Program is made possible by an annual appropriation of $100,000 from the New Jersey State Legislature.

For the 1968-69 school year, the first year of operation of the Teacher Innovation Program, 497 projects were submitted to the State Education Department, where they were judged by a committee of five staff members. The recommendations of this committee were reviewed by the Title III State Advisory Council. One hundred eight projects were selected to be sent to the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education for approval. The awards ranged from $300 to $1,000.

Since the money available for minigrants is limited, many more proposals are submitted than are funded. Consequently, obtaining an idea for a project and writing a proposal developing this idea assumes the form of a competition for teachers.

The New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program can be conceptualized as a specific strategy for promoting educational change. First, it is a strategy based on the confidence that teachers have innovative ideas, which, if put into effect, are capable of producing change in some aspect of the overall school environment. To the extent that innovative ideas can result in changes in school settings, the classroom teachers in command of those ideas assume the role of change agents. Second, it is a strategy aimed in a limited way at reversing the typical hierarchical flow of change in schools, which proceeds from administrators to teachers. Administrators can control change because they have both authority and money. Authority enables them to make decisions about the content of school programs; money permits them to carry out their decisions. The Teacher Innovation Program, through minigrants, provides an immediate infusion of money directly into classrooms. This infusion allows teachers' talents to be recognized and status to be conferred on them, acts which conceivably might modify the hierarchy by which professional personnel of schools are organized.

The purpose of the study reported here is to examine a specific subset of classroom teachers as agents for change in the public schools. This subset of teachers comprises those who received minigrants for the 1968-69 school year, the first year of the New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program. The study of the first group of minigrant recipients is an initial step toward discovering the dynamics of a strategy for educational change which makes funds available directly to classroom teachers for developing and implementing their own ideas about teaching-learning in their schools.

Objectives

The general purpose of this study may be more carefully specified through the statement of the following objectives.

1. To discover some characteristics of the 1968-69 minigrant recipients and their projects. This objective aimed at describing selected demographic and professional characteristics of the recipients, together with their perceptions of and attitudes toward aspects of teaching and the teaching environments in their schools. The objective also concerned some characteristics of the origin and development of recipients' projects, including the process of applying for a minigrant.

2. To determine the effects of the minigrant recipients' projects on themselves and on others. More specifically, the study focused on the effects of the projects on students, teachers and administrators, parents, and school board members, in addition to the recipients themselves. The study examined the spread of effects of the minigrant projects to learn whether the influence of the projects was limited, for example, to recipients' teaching areas in their buildings, or whether the influence extended to other buildings in recipients' districts, or to other districts. It was also a purpose of the study to learn the nature of the effects of the projects on the recipients and on others.

3. To determine the means by which information about minigrant recipients' projects was disseminated. This objective concerned the methods of communication which enabled teachers, parents, and school board members to learn about the minigrant projects.

CHAPTER II

Methods

Data-Gathering Instruments

The information required to attain the objectives stated in Chapter I is chiefly objective and reportorial in nature. It was therefore decided to use a mailed questionnaire as the principal data-gathering instrument. It was also decided to use the minigrant recipient himself as the source for the needed information, since presumably he was the single person most closely associated with all phases of the minigrant project. While the recipient might not be totally impartial in reporting on his project because of his emotional ties to it, there seemed little question that he would be more informed about the project than anyone else. More dispassionate observers in a school district would likely know considerably less about a project. The fact that self-reports are limited to what a respondent is able and is willing to tell, of course, is well known.

The decision to use the minigrant recipient as the basic source of data collected by means of a questionnaire resulted from preliminary visits to seven projects in June 1969. In the course of these visits it became evident that the recipient knew more about his project than anyone else in the school district.

Following the preliminary visits to projects, an initial draft of a structured recipient's questionnaire was devised, based on the objectives in Chapter I. This draft was reviewed by staff members in the New Jersey State Department of Education's Office of Research. The final form of the questionnaire, which appears in Appendix 1, resulted from the comments of these staff members.

It was felt that administrators in schools where there were minigrant projects might be in a position to supplement any information furnished by recipients. Consequently, a questionnaire was prepared for the administrator most knowledgeable about the minigrant recipient's project. The procedures for developing the administrator's questionnaire were similar to those for the recipient's questionnaire. The administrator's questionnaire is found in Appendix 1.

The data supplied by the minigrant recipient's questionnaire were further supplemented by visits to selected projects. Twenty projects to be visited were selected at random from those for which completed recipient's questionnaires were available. The selection of these projects was controlled to assure representation for urban, suburban, and rural schools. The group of 20 projects included two in rural schools, six in urban schools, and 12 in suburban schools - roughly the same proportions for these three categories of schools found in the total group of projects for which there were completed minigrant recipient's questionnaires. The main purpose of these visits was to learn about the nature and effects of the projects at first hand from the recipients and others acquainted with the minigrant projects. The interviews conducted during the visits were relatively unstructured, and were recorded on audio tape whenever possible.

Data Collection

There were two deadlines for submitting minigrant proposals to the New Jersey State Department of Education for the 1968-69 school year - November 15 and December 15, 1968. This meant that projects could not be started much before the middle of 1968-69. While some recipients completed their projects by June 1969, others did not complete theirs until 1969-70. Some recipients even delayed initiating their projects until Fall 1969.

To assure maximum participation in the study, questionnaires were not mailed to the minigrant recipients until the middle of 1969-70. On December 12, 1969, a questionnaire was sent to each of the 108 recipients. In instances where two or more individuals seemed associated with a project, the questionnaire was directed to only one of them.

Responses to the original mailing were received from 61 recipients by February 1970. About February 15, a follow-up letter was sent by Dr. Thomas Adams of the Teacher Innovation Program, urging the remaining recipients to cooperate in the study. This second appeal brought the number of questionnaires to 88, or approximately four-fifths of the total group of minigrant recipients. One of these questionnaires was judged unusable; another arrived too late for inclusion in the study.

The fact that 20 recipients did not participate in the study has a variety of explanations. Some projects, although approved by the State Department of Education, were never initiated. In these instances the grant funds were returned to the State Department. Some recipients left their teaching positions before their projects were completed. When this occurred, the project was usually finished by someone else. One recipient died. Finally, a few had still not completed their projects at the time of the February 15 follow-up to the December 12, 1969, questionnaire mailing to recipients. The number of recipients who actually declined to cooperate in the study was relatively small.

On April 6, 1970, a questionnaire was mailed to the administrative official most knowledgeable about the work of each of the minigrant recipients for whom there was a usable questionnaire. Wherever possible, the questionnaire was directed to a building principal. In a few instances, however, it was necessary to send the questionnaire to the central office of the school district. In cases where there was more than one minigrant project at a school, the administrator was asked to complete a questionnaire for only one of the projects. Among the group of schools participating in the study there were five which had two projects. Of the 81 administrators contacted, 45 returned usable questionnaires.

The visits to 20 randomly-selected projects occurred during April and May 1970. The length of visits varied from two to five hours, depending on factors such as the availability of the recipient, the extent the recipient wished to talk about his project, and the availability of others able to tell something about the project. Each visit involved conversations with the recipient and at least one administrator acquainted with the project. Wherever possible, students involved in the recipient's project, as well as other teachers in the recipient's building, were also interviewed.

Data Processing

The recipient's and the administrator's questionnaires were scored and the results tabulated by hand under the close supervision of the investigator.

CHAPTER III

Findings and Analysis

Introduction

The data collected in the study were analyzed to achieve the objectives stated in Chapter I. In accomplishing these objectives, the primary focus of the study was on data gathered using the minigrant recipient's questionnaire, with information from the administrator's questionnaire and the visits to selected projects introduced only when pertinent. Since administrator's questionnaires were available for only 45 of the projects in the study, caution was required in employing the results.

Data from the 86 recipient's questionnaires were summarized in terms of frequencies and percentages[2] of recipients or projects for dimensions selected to describe the 1968-69 minigrant winners and the effects of their projects. The findings are organized into four major sections dealing with the following topics: (1) characteristics of minigrant recipients; (2) characteristics of the origin and development of recipients' projects; (3) effects of the projects on recipients and others; (4) dissemination of information about the projects.

Characteristics of Minigrant Recipients

The minigrant recipient's questionnaire provided information on selected demographic and professional characteristics of the 86 subjects of the study, as well as on the subjects' perceptions, interests, and values related to their teaching and their teaching environments.

One demographic characteristic examined was sex. As indicated in Table 1, the group of recipients was almost evenly divided on the basis of sex, with 44 men and 42 women.

TABLE 1

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Sex (N=86)

Sex	No. of recipients	%
Male	44	51.2
Female	42	48.8
Total	86	100.0

---

[2] Not all recipients responded to each item in the questionnaire. Unless otherwise stated, the percentages in each table are based on the total group of 86 recipients.

A second demographic characteristic investigated was the age of the recipients at the time the minigrant awards were made. The findings for age are contained in Table 2. The recipients ranged in age from their early twenties to over fifty, with the median age between 35 and 39. While the largest number of recipients, 28, was in the 30-39 age group, substantial numbers, 21 and 22 respectively, were in the 20-29 and 40-49 brackets. Fourteen recipients were 50 years of age or older.

TABLE 2

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Age
(N=85)

Age	No. of recipients	%
20 - 24	4	4.7
25 - 29	17	19.8
30 - 34	17	19.8
35 - 39	11	12.8
40 - 44	12	14.0
45 - 49	10	11.6
50 and older	14	16.3
Total	85	99.0

Findings for the relationship between the sex and age of recipients are presented in Table 3. As indicated in this table, there were more men recipients under 35 than over. However, there were more than twice as many women recipients above 35 as below. Thus, younger recipients tended to be men, while older recipients tended to be women.

TABLE 3

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Sex and Age
(N=85)

	Sex			
	Male		Female	
Age	No. of recipients	%	No. of recipients	%
Under 35	25	29.1	13	15.1
35 or older	18	20.9	29	33.7
Total	43	50.0	42	48.8

Information was obtained on selected professional characteristics of the minigrant recipients. These characteristics included number of years teaching in the system at the time of the minigrant award, total number of years teaching, level of higher education, institution granting the undergraduate degree, teaching level, certification status, membership in professional organizations, extent of professional reading, and professional aspirations.

Data on the number of years recipients had taught in their school districts at the time of the minigrant awards are summarized in Table 4. As indicated in this table, the number of years teaching reported by recipients ranged from one to more than 20 years, with the median between four and five years. Approximately two-thirds of the recipients had taught four years or longer in districts where they were at the time of the awards. If three years is accepted as the amount of teaching which must be done in a school system in order to receive tenure, then approximately two-thirds of the recipients were tenured teachers.

TABLE 4

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Years Taught in School Districts at the Time Grants Were Awarded (N=85)

Number of years		No. of recipients	%
1		6	7.0
2- 3		20	23.3
4- 5		19	22.1
6-10		21	24.4
11-15		9	10.5
16-20		4	4.7
More than 20		6	7.0
	Total	85	99.0

Information was also obtained from the minigrant recipients concerning their total teaching experience up-to-and-including 1968-69. These findings occur in Table 5. Approximately three-fourths of the recipients had taught more than five years at the time of the minigrants. Twelve recipients reported more than 20 years teaching experience.

TABLE 5

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Total Years Teaching Experience in 1968-69 (N=86)

Number of years		No. of recipients	%
1		2	2.3
2- 3		8	9.3
4- 5		10	11.6
6-10		32	37.2
11-15		14	16.3
16-20		8	9.3
More than 20		12	14.0
	Total	86	100.0

Information about the level of higher education attained by the recipients is found in Table 6. This table identifies the number of recipients reaching the various plateaus, or degree levels, of higher education, as well as the number of recipients between degree levels. Only one of the 86 recipients did not hold an undergraduate degree. Thirty-nine recipients held a baccalaureate degree, 43 a master's degree, and two a doctorate. Slightly less than half the group of 86 recipients had taken college course work beyond the master's degree level.

TABLE 6

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Level of Higher Education (N=85)

Level of higher education	No. of recipients	%
Attended college, but no baccalaureate degree	1	1.2
Held a baccalaureate degree	5	5.8
Held a baccalaureate degree plus additional college work, but not in an advanced degree program	14	16.3
Held a baccalaureate degree plus additional college work in an advanced degree program	20	23.3
Held a master's degree	5	5.8
Held a master's degree plus additional college work, but not in an advanced degree program	34	39.5
Held a master's degree plus additional college work in an advanced degree program	4	4.7
Held a doctor's degree	2	2.3
Total	85	98.9

Sixty-four recipients reported the names of the institutions which granted their baccalaureate degrees. These institutions represented 13 different states and the District of Columbia. However, the bulk of the recipients were graduated from colleges in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York. New Jersey had 26, Pennsylvania 14, and New York 8. Nineteen recipients received degrees from New Jersey State Colleges. Of these institutions, Trenton State College graduated seven.

Table 7 presents information about the school levels where the minigrant recipients did their teaching in 1968-69. Forty recipients reported that they taught either regular classrooms or special subjects at the elementary level. Eleven recipients identified themselves with teaching in junior schools; 23 said they taught in high schools. Nine recipients, most of whom were connected in some way with an elementary, intermediate, junior, or high school, could not describe their work as involving regular classroom teaching or teaching special subjects. Six of this group of 9 recipients included, for example, an assistant principal for curriculum and instruction, an audio-visual director, a reading consultant, a science specialist with no specific teaching duties, and two guidance counselors. One recipient taught in a post-high school technical institute.

Of the 11 junior school teachers, three indicated they taught mathematics, two reading, two physical science, and two special education. The 23 high school teachers included five in mathematics, four each in English and physical science, three in social studies, and two in biology. The group of 40 elementary teachers comprised 16 regular classroom teachers from Grades K-3, 12 regular classroom teachers from grades 4-6, and 12 teachers of special subjects.

A number of recipients had quasi-administrative positions in their schools in addition to their teaching assignments. Seven high school teachers and two junior school teachers reported they were department chairmen. One high school teacher was the mathematics coordinator for grades K-12. One elementary librarian served as coordinator for the elementary libraries in her district.

TABLE 7

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by School Level (N=77)

School level	No. of recipients	%
Elementary school	40	46.5
Intermediate school	3	3.5
Junior school	11	12.8
High school	23	26.7
Total	77	89.5

Note.: This table is based on recipients who identified themselves as regular classroom teachers or teachers of special subjects. Nine recipients did not view themselves as regular classroom teachers or teachers of special subjects at any of the four school levels indicated in the table.

The relationship between the recipients' sex and school level was examined. The results of this investigation are reported in Table 8. When the group of elementary teachers was analyzed by sex, there were 32 women compared to eight men. The reverse occurred for the group of junior and high school teachers. An analysis of this combined group revealed 30 men and four women. Recipients teaching at the elementary level were much more likely to be women, while recipients teaching at the junior or high school levels were more apt to be men.

TABLE 8

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Sex and School Level

(N=77)

	School level							
	Elementary school		Intermediate school		Junior school		High school	
Sex	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	8	9.3	1	1.2	10	11.6	20	23.3
Female	32	37.2	2	2.3	1	1.2	3	3.5
Total	40	46.5	3	3.5	11	12.8	23	26.8

Information on the certification status of the recipients is reported in Table 9. This table indicates that 82 of the 86 minigrant recipients held New Jersey certificates for their 1968-69 school positions. Seventy-nine of the 82 recipients identifying themselves as teachers said they held standard (regular) New Jersey teaching certificates in 1968-69.

TABLE 9

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Certification and Teacher Status

(N=86)

	New Jersey certification			
	Yes		No	
Teacher	No. of recipients	%	No. of recipients	%
Yes	79	91.8	3	3.5
No	3	3.5	1	1.2
Total	82	95.3	4	4.7

Information concerning the membership of minigrant recipients in teacher organizations is presented in Table 10. These organizations include local teacher associations, teacher union locals, the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA), and the National Education Association (NEA). Seventy-nine reported membership in their local teacher associations in 1968-69, while five were affiliated with teacher union locals. (Two recipients said they belonged to both groups.) Seventy-seven recipients indicated membership in the NJEA, a statewide professional organization for teachers in New Jersey, while 49 said they were members of the NEA.

Minigrant recipients were asked about the roles they played in their local teacher associations and teacher union locals. Of the 79 recipients indicating membership in local teacher associations, 36, or about 45 per cent, said they had served their associations in some leadership capacity, while 42 said they had been members only. Two of the five recipients reporting membership in teacher union locals indicated leadership roles in their locals. Eight recipients reported playing some leadership role in the NJEA, four in the NEA. The leadership roles in the NJEA and NEA consisted mainly of chairing or serving on committees.

TABLE 10

Number and Percentage of Minigrant
Recipients by Membership in Teacher Organizations
(N=86)

Teacher organization	No. of recipients	%
Local Teacher Association	79	91.8
Teacher Union Local	5	5.8
New Jersey Education Association (NJEA)	77	89.5
National Education Association (NEA)	49	57.0

A group of 47 recipients indicated membership in one or more of more than 60 different state, regional, or national professional organizations. Examples of some of the more widely-known organizations included the International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Kappa Delta Pi, and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Recipients were asked about the number of professional books, excluding those used in conjunction with college courses, they had read during the year preceding their minigrants. The results of the analysis of recipients' professional reading appear in Table 11. Sixteen recipients reported reading no professional books, while 18 indicated they read more than 10. The median number of professional books read by the 78 recipients was 3-5.

TABLE 11

Number and Percentage of Minigrant
Recipients by Number of Professional Books Read in 1967-68
(N=78)

Number of books	No. of recipients	%
None	16	18.6
1- 2	8	9.3
3- 5	22	25.6
6-10	14	16.3
More than 10	18	20.9
Total	78	90.7

Recipients were asked about the nature of the professional work in which they might be involved five years hence. Information on the professional aspirations of the recipients is summarized in Table 12. Twenty-eight recipients, only about one-third of the group, envisioned themselves still directly involved in classroom teaching in five years. Forty-two recipients, or almost half the group, anticipated they would hold specialized staff positions, e.g., guidance counselor, or administrative-supervisory positions in five years.

TABLE 12

Number and Percentage of Minigrant
Recipients by Professional Status Anticipated in 1975
(N-85)

Professional status in 1975	No. of recipients	%
Teaching the same grade or subject	23	26.7
Teaching a different grade or subject	5	5.8
Specialized staff position in a public school, e.g., guidance counselor	13	15.1
Administrative or supervisory position in a public school	29	33.7
Educationally-related work, but not in a public school	12	14.0
Not in teaching or educationally-related work	3	3.5
Total	85	98.8

While the study dealt mostly with variables for which there were little or no state or national data available, it was possible to evaluate some of the demographic and professional characteristics of the minigrant recipients in terms of New Jersey and national information. These New Jersey and United States data, which were obtained in a 1969 survey conducted through the combined efforts of the Research Divisions of the National Education Association and the New Jersey Education Association, are found in Chart 1.[3] Also included in Chart 1 are data for the group of 86 minigrant recipients. It should be noted that the data in this chart represent sample statistics.

As indicated in Chart 1, the minigrant recipients were comparable to New Jersey and United States teachers on some dimensions and quite different on others. The average minigrant recipient tended to be slightly older than the average New Jersey teacher, but about the same age as the average teacher in the United States. The proportion of men in the group of recipients was considerably higher than it was among either New Jersey or United States teachers. Also, there was a larger proportion of recipients than New Jersey or United States teachers with master's degrees. While number of years teaching in the present system and total teaching experience of recipients seemed comparable to those of New Jersey and United States teachers, a smaller proportion of recipients had three years or less experience in their districts than New Jersey teachers had. Roughly the same proportions of minigrant recipients as New Jersey teachers belonged to state and local teacher organizations. However, a proportionately greater number of recipients than New Jersey teachers belonged to the National Education Association.

---

[3] "What's Happened to (New Jersey) Teacher?", NJEA Review, 43 (April 1970), 22-23.

CHART 1

A Comparison of the 1968-69 Minigrant Recipients with Samples of Teachers from New Jersey and the United States on Selected Demographic and Professional Characteristics

	1968-69 minigrant recipients	New Jersey teachers	United States teachers
Median age (years)	35-39	33	37
Sex			
Men	51.2%	36.2%	35.1%
Women	48.8%	63.8%	64.9%
Highest degree held			
Bachelor's	45.4%	69.0%	65.0%
Master's or higher	52.3%	25.0%	30.0%
No degree	1.2%	6.0%	5.0%
Teaching experience			
Median years - total	6 -10	7	9
Median years - present district	4 - 5	4	5
Teaching for first year	7.0%	9.1%	8.0%
Teaching 3 years or less in district	30.3%	42.0%	n.d.
Professional association membership			
Local	91.8%	90.9%	n.d.
NJEA	89.5%	86.0%	n.d.
NEA	57.0%	48.4%	n.d.
AFT	5.8%	3.5%	n.d.

n.d. = no data available

The remainder of this section on the characteristics of the minigrant recipients is devoted to exploring some of the recipients' perceptions, interests, and values pertaining to teaching.

The study investigated the recipients' perceptions of the climates in their schools for trying out new ideas in the classroom. The investigation emphasized two dimensions of these climates. One dimension concerned the leadership role of administrators in encouraging teachers to try new ideas, preventing them from doing so, or assuming a laissez-faire position of neither encouraging nor discouraging teachers while leaving them free to try new ideas if they wish. The second dimension involved the control function of administrators. Administrators can control classroom innovation by the extent they want to be informed about the new ideas teachers attempt.

Findings on the climates for classroom innovation in the recipients' schools are reported in Table 13. Fifty-nine recipients indicated that administrators encouraged new ideas in the classroom, while 21 said they were free, but not necessarily encouraged, to innovate. Only one recipient reported that new ideas were discouraged. With respect to the dimension of control, 67 recipients indicated that administrators wanted to be informed about new ideas attempted in classrooms, while 13 stated that it was not necessary to inform the administration. Recipients, then, taught in schools where administrators tended to exert leadership by encouraging classroom innovation, but also maintained the hierarchical lines of authority by requiring that teachers inform them about new ideas tried.

TABLE 13

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Climate for Classroom Innovation Stimulated by Administrators
(N=82)

Climate	No. of recipients	%
Teachers encouraged to try new ideas by administrators who want to be informed	49	57.0
Teachers encouraged to try new ideas by administrators who do not need to be informed	10	11.6
Teachers are free to try new ideas -- administrators want to be informed	18	20.9
Teachers are free to try new ideas -- administrators do not need to be informed	3	3.5
Teachers may only try ideas originated by administrators	1	1.2
Teachers discouraged from trying new ideas by administrators	1	1.2
Total	82	95.4

Innovation in teaching may center on content to be learned, methods and strategies for teaching content, or materials and technology used in teaching. An innovation in teaching might comprise, for example, introducing new or different concepts in social studies, using a new procedure or strategy to teach a familiar reading skill, or developing some unique materials for teaching a concept in mathematics. Recipients reported the extent their teaching prior to receiving minigrants reflected each of the three foci of innovation mentioned above. The results of this inquiry appear in Table 14. This table reveals that minigrant recipients saw themselves using all three kinds of innovation before applying for minigrants.

TABLE 14

Number of Recipients by Type and Frequency of Innovation Prior to Applying for Minigrants
(N=81)

	Frequency of innovation		
Type of innovation	Frequently (10 or more times per year)	Sometimes (3-9 times per year)	Almost never (0-2 times per year)
Introducing new content	44	34	1
Using new methods and strategies	45	36	-
Using different materials and technology	45	32	-

The teaching act comprises a number of tasks, each of which involves the teacher in a somewhat different role. Some possible teaching tasks include the following:

1. choosing objectives,
2. presenting content to be learned,
3. fostering social and emotional development in pupils,
4. developing learning materials,
5. diagnosing pupil weaknesses,
6. correcting pupil weaknesses, and
7. evaluating pupils and procedures.

These seven tasks were portrayed in the recipient's questionnaire in the form of situations which a teacher might encounter in the course of this work in the classroom. The situations used in the questionnaire were as follows:

1. deciding what should be taught to a group of pupils,
2. presenting a concept to a group of pupils,
3. helping a shy pupil relate more effectively to other youngsters,
4. preparing learning materials for pupils,
5. determining what weaknesses given pupils have in a subject field,
6. working with an individual pupil to correct a particular deficiency, and
7. determining the effects of a particular teaching strategy on pupils.

Recipients ranked the seven teaching tasks in order of the interest of the tasks to them. The mean rankings, based on 78 recipients, are presented in Table 15. According to the evidence in this table, recipients on the average expressed greatest interest in presenting content to be learned. The two next most preferred tasks were choosing objectives and developing learning materials. Recipients on the average seemed least interested in fostering social-emotional development in pupils, followed by evaluating pupils and procedures. It should be noted, however, that a number of the differences between the mean ranks for the teaching tasks in Table 15 are relatively small.

Presenting content, choosing objectives, and preparing learning materials constitute the fundamental work performed by teachers everyday in classrooms in processing subject matter to be learned. These three tasks receive heavy emphasis in pre-service teacher preparation and are concerns of administrators and supervisors in evaluating teachers' performance in the classroom. The minigrant recipients seemed to share an interest in tasks many professional educators consider to be the essence of teaching.

TABLE 15
Mean Rankings of Minigrant Recipients' Interest in Selected Teaching Tasks
(N=78)

Teaching task	Mean rank
Presenting a concept to a group of pupils	3.04
Deciding what should be taught to a group of pupils	3.77
Preparing learning materials for pupils	3.86
Determining what weaknesses given pupils have in a subject field	4.08
Working with an individual pupil to correct a particular deficiency	4.17
Determining the effects of a particular teaching strategy on pupils	4.47
Helping a shy youngster relate more effectively to other youngsters	4.62

Teachers receive from a variety of sources cues which guide the content and style of their teaching. These sources, or models, can range from the teacher himself to several external reference points, including administrators, teacher education courses, textbook manuals, and the like. In this study, seven models for guiding teaching were selected as follows:

1. the teacher's own ideas,
2. suggestions of administrators and supervisors
3. performances and suggestions of teachers considered superior,
4. suggestions in textbook manuals and curriculum guides
5. content from teacher education courses,
6. interests of pupils, and
7. desires and opinions of parents.

Recipients ranked the seven models in the order they made use of them in their teaching. The mean rankings, based on 80 recipients, are found in Table 16. An inspection of the mean rankings in this table reveals an almost bimodal distribution, with three of the models for guiding teaching clustered in a preferred mode and three grouped in a rejected mode. Recipients showed a clear preference for using their own thinking to guide their teaching. Since the other six models are external, i.e. outside the teacher, the recipients might be considered more inner-directed than other-directed, in terms of a formulation developed several years ago by the social scientist David Riesman.[4] The models ranked second and third in order of use by recipients in their own teaching were interests of pupils and performances of superior teachers. At the other extreme, recipients viewed ways favored by parents as being least useful in their work, followed by teacher education courses taught in colleges, and suggestions of administrators and supervisors.

---

[4] David Riesman. The Lonely Crowd, (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1950) pp. 13-31.

There seemed to be an incongruity between recipients' views of students and their views of parents as sources for guiding their teaching. The pupil and his parents form a single client-unit. However, the recipients separated the two, accepting the pupil as a model for teaching ideas, while apparently rejecting his parents for the same purpose.

A second aspect of the data on teaching models concerns the relative unimportance assigned by recipients to two traditional power centers in education - school administrators and college based teacher education - as contributors to teaching in the classroom. Recipients did not seem to evaluate either of these two resources as helpful to them in the work of the classroom. Moreover, although courses in teacher education were perceived as having little relevance to classroom teaching, recipients seemed to have been heavily involved in taking courses beyond their initial degrees, in fact, even beyond the master's degree. It is possible that the courses taken by the recipients did not involve professional education. If such professional courses were taken, the primary purpose of this activity may not have been the improvement of the recipients' ability to teach. The information obtained about the professional aspirations of the recipients suggests that they may have had other purposes in mind in taking further work in college. It is highly ironic if recipients devoted time and money to additional preparation judged by them to have little use in classroom teaching.

TABLE 16

Mean Rankings of Minigrant Recipients'
Use of Models for Guiding Teaching
(N=80)

Model for guiding teaching	Mean rank
Teacher's own ideas regarding what to teach and how to teach it	1.50
Ways pupils enjoy most	2.63
Ways used by superior teachers whom the teacher knows and has seen	3.01
Ways suggested by textbook manuals and curriculum guides	4.10
Ways suggested by administrators and supervisors	4.90
Ways stressed in teacher education courses in college	5.24
Content and techniques favored by parents	6.63

Origin and Development of the Minigrant Projects

The minigrant recipients were asked about the nature, origin, and development of their projects, as well as about the process of obtaining a minigrant to implement their projects. Brief descriptions of the minigrant projects of the 86 subjects of this study appear in Appendix 2.

A recipient's project could be characterized in one of the following three ways;

1. Adoption. The recipient's project represented completely the thinking of others.

2. Adaption. The recipient's project represented the thinking of others modified in terms of the recipient's own ideas to conform to the exigencies of his teaching situation.

3. Creation. The recipient's project represented his own thinking.

Recipients reported whether they thought their projects typified adoption, adaption, or creation. Information on the type of innovation represented by the minigrant projects is found in Table 17. As indicated in this table, slightly more than half the recipients felt their projects were creative; only five recipients reported their projects to be adoptions.

TABLE 17

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Type of Innovation Perceived by Recipients (N=83)

Type of innovation	No. of projects	%
Adoption	5	5.8
Adaption	32	37.2
Creation	46	53.5
Total	83	96.5

It was possible to compare recipients' perceptions of their own projects with their perceptions of the innovative attempts of other teachers in their buildings. Recipients indicated whether their colleagues' attempts at innovation represented adoption, adaption, or creation. These data are summarized in Table 18. A comparison of Tables 17 and 18 shows that recipients, while tending to view their own projects as creative, saw the innovative attempts of their co-workers principally as adaption or adoption. Only 14 recipients reported the innovations of their fellow teachers to be creative.

TABLE 18

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Recipients by Perception of Type of Innovating Done by Other Teachers in Their Buildings (N=72)

Type of innovation by other teachers	No. of recipients	%
Adaption	41	47.7
Creation	14	16.3
Adoption	12	14.0
None	5	5.8
Total	72	83.8

There were several sources from which a recipient might have obtained the idea for his project, including the recipient's own thinking; non-public school professional sources such as professional reading, college courses, and meetings of professional organizations; professionals in public school work, ranging from close teaching associates to central office administrators in his district and personnel in other school districts; and non-professional sources such as general reading, school board members, parents, and students. The results of the investigation of the sources of ideas for recipients' projects are contained in Table 19. Forty-seven of the 86 recipients attributed the ideas for their projects to their own thinking. The next most frequently reported source was professional reading, indicated by 13 recipients. Only five recipients said an administrator or supervisor in their buildings was the source of the idea for their projects.

The reports of administrators tended to confirm the information furnished by recipients concerning the sources of ideas for their projects. Twenty-eight of the 45 administrators indicated that the recipients' projects were the products of their own thinking.

TABLE 19

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Source of Ideas for Projects (N=86)

Source of ideas	No. of projects	%
Recipient's own thinking	47	54.6
Non-public school professional source		
Professional reading	13	15.0
College courses	3	3.5
Meetings of professional organizations	1	1.2
Other	9	10.5
Professionals in public schools		
Administrator or supervisor in recipient's building	5	5.8
Teacher in a different teaching area in recipient's building	3	3.5
Teacher in the same teaching area in recipient's building	1	1.2
Administrator on the central office staff	1	1.2
Non-professional source		
General reading	2	2.3
Other	1	1.2
Total	86	100.0

A number of interests may have influenced minigrant recipients to develop projects. Four such interests include the following: changes in pupils which might result from the project, subject matter to be taught, special materials or technological equipment, and new methods or techniques for teaching. Recipients ranked these four interests in the order in which they influenced the development of their projects. Mean rankings for the interests, based on 76 recipients, are presented in Table 20. From this table, interest in changing pupils had the most influence on the development of the recipients' projects, while materials or technological equipment had the least influence.

Thirty-six of the 45 administrators in the study ranked the same four interests according to their influence on the development of the recipients' projects. An examination of the mean rankings of the administrators revealed a tendency for administrators and recipients to allot first and last preference to the same interests. The administrators reported that interest in changing pupils influenced recipients most in developing their projects, while interest in materials or technological equipment influenced them the least.

TABLE 20

Mean Rankings of Interests Influencing the Development of Minigrant Recipients' Projects

(N=76)

Interest	Mean rank
Changes in pupils	1.59
Subject matter taught	2.51
Methods or techniques of teaching	2.57
Materials or technological equipment	3.33

Obtaining an innovative idea was only one part of the process of receiving a minigrant. Another important phase of the process involved the decision to apply for the grant. Possible sources of help for the recipient in this decision included professionals in public schools, ranging from teachers and administrators in the recipient's building to teachers and administrators in other districts; professional educators not involved in public school work such as State Department of Education personnel, personnel of professional organizations, and college professors; and non-professionals such as school board members, parents, and students. Recipients indicated the person who influenced them most in deciding to apply for a grant. The data for this investigation are summarized in Table 21. As indicated in this table, 34 recipients were influenced to apply for minigrants by their building administrators or supervisors, while 24 were influenced by central office administrators. Only 16 recipients reported that no one helped them decide to seek a minigrant.

The data supplied by recipients on sources of help for them in deciding to apply for minigrants tended to be confirmed by information collected from administrators. Of 43 administrators, 18 reported that a building administrator or supervisor helped recipients to decide to apply for minigrants, eight indicated that a central office administrator helped, and 11 said that no one aided the recipients in their decisions.

TABLE 21

Number and Percentage of Recipients by
Source of Help in Deciding to Apply for a Minigrant
(N=85)

Source of help in application decision	No. of recipients	%
No one helped	16	18.6
Professionals in public schools		
Administrator or supervisor in recipient's building	34	39.5
Administrator on the central office staff	24	27.9
Teacher in a different teaching area in recipient's building	3	3.5
Teacher in the same teaching area in recipient's building	1	1.2
Professionals not in public schools		
College professor	2	2.3
Professional organization personnel	1	1.2
Other	2	2.3
Non-professionals		
Parent	1	1.2
Other	1	1.2
Total	85	98.9

In addition to direct, external influence from various individuals, a number of indirect, internal stimuli also may have helped recipients to decide to apply for minigrants. Five such stimuli examined in this study included the recipient's confidence in his ability to win a minigrant, the feeling that the recipient's project was so important it was worth the effort of writing a proposal, the feeling that a minigrant would give the recipient increased professional recognition, the feeling that applying for a minigrant was expected by others, and the feeling that a minigrant was a means of obtaining materials or equipment available in no other way. The recipients ranked these five reasons in the order of their diminishing influence on applying for a minigrant. Mean rankings for the reasons, based on 74 recipients, are contained in Table 22. The results in this table suggest the recipients' view of the importance of their projects influenced them most in deciding to apply for a minigrant. The second most influential reason concerned the minigrant as a means of getting materials or technological equipment perhaps obtainable in no other way. Of least influence on the recipients proved to be the reason that applying for a minigrant was something expected of the recipients by others.

Thirty-two of the 45 administrators ranked the five reasons for applying for a minigrant in order of their diminishing influence on the recipients. The order of the mean rankings of the 32 administrators was the same as the order for the 74 recipients. Apparently the administrators saw the recipients influenced most in their decisions to apply for minigrants by feelings about the importance of their projects and the need for materials or equipment to implement the projects.

A comparison of recipients' accounts of the origins of the ideas on which their projects were based with their reasons for deciding to seek minigrants discloses an inconsistency. When recipients were concerned with the ideas for their projects, materials and equipment seemed to play a minor role. On the other hand, when the concern was finding funds to implement the projects, the issue of materials and equipment clearly moved into the foreground of importance.

A second inconsistency relates to the finding that a substantial number of recipients reported being influenced by administrators to apply for minigrants, but did not acknowledge this influence in ranking reasons for seeking minigrants (the feeling that applying for a minigrant was expected by others tended to be ranked last by recipients). Recipients may be suggesting that, while administrators urged them to apply for minigrants, this press was not an important internal stimulus for their writing and submitting proposals.

TABLE 22

Mean Rankings of Reasons Recipients
Applied for Minigrants
(N=74)

Reason	Mean rank
Overall importance of the project	1.74
Means for obtaining materials or equipment	2.05
Confidence in one's own ability to win a grant	3.18
Increased professional recognition	3.85
Expectations of others	4.18

As recipients wrote proposals to obtain funds for their projects, it was possible for them to consult others in varying degrees. Individuals who might have been consulted included the categories of professionals and non-professionals identified earlier in connection with the analysis of the data on persons helping recipients decide to apply for minigrants. The numbers of recipients consulting various categories of professionals and non-professionals appear in Table 23. Building administrators or supervisors and central office administrators were most frequently consulted, with 36 and 37 instances respectively mentioned by recipients. Teachers in the same teaching area in the recipient's building comprised the next most consulted group, with 18 cases. Sixteen recipients said they consulted no one in preparing their minigrant proposals.

Administrators also reported the individuals consulted by recipients as they developed their minigrant proposals. Of 43 administrators, 26 indicated recipients conferred with building administrators or supervisors, 17 reported central office administrators were consulted, and 10 said that teachers from the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings were involved in the preparation of proposals. The data from the administrators paralleled those from the recipients.

TABLE 23

Number and Percentage of Recipients by Individual Consulted in Preparing Minigrant Proposals (N=86)

Individual consulted	No. of recipients	%
None	16	18.6
Professionals in public schools		
Administrator on the central office staff	37	43.0
Administrator or supervisor in recipient's building	36	41.9
Teacher in the same teaching area in recipient's building	18	20.9
Teacher in a different teaching area in recipient's building	6	7.0
Teacher in another building in recipient's school district	4	4.7
Administrator in another building in recipient's school district	2	2.3
Teacher in another school district	2	2.3
Professionals not in public schools		
State Department of Education personnel	7	8.1
College professor	4	4.7
Professional organization personnel	2	2.3
Other	1	1.2
Non-professionals		
Student	2	2.3
Parent	1	1.2
School board member	1	1.2
Other	5	5.8

In addition to indicating the individuals consulted in preparing their minigrant proposals, recipients estimated the degree to which each was consulted. The intensity of consultation could range from talking once or twice with a person about the project to a relationship in which the proposal largely became the work of the person consulted. A summary of the degree recipients consulted others in preparing their proposals occurs in Table 24. This table suggests that any consultation obtained by recipients was not intensive. However, recipients were apt to work somewhat more closely with building administrators or supervisors in readying their proposals than with central office personnel, or with fellow teachers in their own fields in their buildings.

A more detailed analysis of the data on intensity of consultation disclosed that eleven of the 36 recipients reporting they consulted their building administrators indicated they worked closely with these individuals in developing the proposals, while only eight of the 37 who consulted central office administrators, and four of the 18 who consulted teachers in their fields in their buildings indicated such conference. Four recipients indicated that their proposals were chiefly the work of one of the individuals they consulted.

Administrators indicated a greater degree of consultation between building administrators and recipients on the preparation of the minigrant proposals than between central office administrators and recipients or between teachers and recipients. Close consultation was reported with 13 of the 26 building administrators who were said to have worked with recipients on their proposals.

TABLE 24

Number of Reports of Recipients by Intensity of Consultation in Preparing Minigrant Proposals (N=86)

Intensity of consultation	No. of reports
Individual consulted once or twice by recipient	58
Individual consulted worked occasionally with recipient	39
Individual consulted worked closely with recipient	27
Proposal largely the work of individual consulted	4

As recipients were executing their projects, a number of different people could have known about them. Table 25 indicates the extent professionals and non-professionals were aware of the implementation of recipients' minigrant projects. In general, the closer individuals were spatially to the recipient the more likely they were to know about his project in operation. Thus, more recipients reported that teachers and administrators in the same building knew about their projects than reported that teachers, administrators, and other professionals at more remote points did. Exceptions to this rule of physical distance were administrators on the central office staff, who were reported by 58 recipients to have been aware of the implementation of their projects. Thirty-six recipients reported that school board members knew about the operation of their projects, the same number who reported that parents were aware of the projects.

TABLE 25

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Categories of Individuals Aware of the Implementation of the Projects (N=84)

Category of individuals aware of implementation	No. of projects	%
No one aware	2	2.3
Professionals in public schools		
Administrator or supervisor in recipient's building	67	77.9
Teacher in the same teaching area in recipient's building	65	75.6
Teacher in a different teaching area in recipient's building	60	69.8
Administrator on the central office staff	58	67.4
Teacher in another building in recipient's school district	36	41.9
Administrator in another building in recipient's school district	35	40.7
Teacher in another school district	23	26.7
Professionals not in public schools		
College professor	24	27.9
State Department of Education personnel	15	17.4
Professional organization personnel	9	10.5
Other	6	7.0
Non-professionals		
Student	37	43.0
Parent	36	41.9
School board member	36	41.9
Other	14	16.3

Minigrant recipients were aware of the feelings of others toward their projects, especially whether others viewed their projects favorably or unfavorably. These feelings could range from strong enthusiasm, through neutrality, to strong negativism. Information on the positive and negative feelings of different groups of professionals and non-professionals toward the minigrant projects, as perceived by recipients, appears in Table 26. Recipients tended to report favorable reactions from others toward their projects. Building administrators, followed by central office administrators, were seen as the most enthusiastic of the various groups of professionals and non-professionals. While some teachers in recipients' buildings were perceived as being strongly enthusiastic about the projects, almost equal numbers of recipients reported their immediate professional associates as merely interested in, but not excited about, the projects.

The results for the administrators on the feelings of others toward minigrant projects were similar to those reported for the recipients. Twenty-nine of 36 administrators reported building administrators were strongly enthusiastic about the projects, while 24 of 35 administrators indicated central office personnel were strongly enthusiastic. However, in reporting the feelings of teachers toward the projects, administrators indicated about as many who were interested but not excited as who were strongly enthusiastic.

TABLE 26

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Type and Source of Feelings of Others Perceived by Recipients (N=84)

Source of feelings	Type of feeling									
	Strong enthusiasm		Interest but no excitement		Neutral		Skepticism		Strong negativism	
	No. of projects	%	No. of projects	%	No. of projects	%	No. of projects	%	No. of projects	%
Professionals in public schools										
Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	37	43.0	33	38.4	3	3.5	-	-	-	-
Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	24	27.9	28	32.6	11	12.8	3	3.5	-	-
Teachers in another building in recipient's school district	15	17.4	17	19.8	5	5.8	1	1.2	-	-
Teachers in another school district	11	12.8	9	10.5	2	2.3	-	-	-	-
Administrators and supervisors in recipient's building	52	60.5	14	16.3	5	5.8	1	1.2	-	-
Administrators in another building in recipient's school district	11	12.8	13	15.1	9	10.5	-	-	-	-
Administrators on the central office staff	44	51.2	14	16.3	5	5.8	-	-	-	-
Professionals not in public schools										
State Department of Education personnel	10	11.6	6	7.0	-	-	1	1.2	-	-
Professional organization personnel	9	10.5	2	2.3	1	1.2	-	-	-	-
College professors	16	18.6	4	4.7	2	2.3	1	1.2	-	-
Others	8	9.3	3	3.5	-	-	-	-	1	1.2
Non-professionals										
School board members	20	23.3	7	8.1	3	3.5	-	-	-	-
Parents	23	26.7	4	4.7	3	3.5	-	-	-	-
Students	29	33.7	5	5.8	1	1.2	-	-	-	-
Others	4	4.7	4	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-

Recipients were also aware of the feelings of others toward the minigrant awards themselves. Data on the positive and negative feelings of different groups of professionals and non-professionals toward minigrants, as perceived by recipients, are reported in Table 27. Seventy-seven recipients indicated some awareness of the feelings of others toward minigrants. These feelings tended to be mildly or strongly enthusiastic. More recipients, a total of 47, reported central office administrators to be strongly enthusiastic about minigrants than reported this level of feeling for any other group of professionals or non-professionals. Forty-three recipients indicated building administrators were strongly enthusiastic about minigrants. There were considerably fewer reports of strong enthusiasm for minigrants on the part of teachers, including teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings.

Thirty-nine of the 45 administrators contributed information on others' feelings about minigrants. The data from administrators supported those from recipients. Administrators indicated a high proportion of building and central office administrators strongly enthusiastic about minigrants. However, approximately as many teachers were reported by administrators as interested in, but not excited about, minigrants as strongly enthusiastic about them.

TABLE 27

Number and Percentage of Recipients Reporting Feelings of Others Toward Minigrants by Type and Source of Feelings (N=77)

Source of feelings	Type of feeling									
	Strong enthusiasm		Interest but no excitement		Neutral		Skepticism		Strong negativism	
	No. of recipients	%	No. of recipients	%	No. of recipients	%	No. of recipients	%	No. of recipients	%
Professionals in public schools										
Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	30	34.9	21	24.4	8	9.3	3	3.5	1	1.2
Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	22	25.6	22	25.6	11	12.8	3	3.5	-	-
Teachers in another building in the recipient's school district	15	17.4	6	7.0	8	9.3	6	7.0	-	-
Teachers in another school district	11	12.8	7	8.1	1	1.2	2	2.3	-	-
Administrators and supervisors in recipient's building	43	50.0	16	18.6	5	5.8	3	3.5	-	-
Administrators in another building in recipient's school district	16	18.6	9	10.5	2	2.3	1	1.2	-	-
Administrators on the central office staff	47	54.7	12	14.0	3	3.5	-	-	-	-
Professionals not in public schools										
State Department of Education personnel	15	17.4	2	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional organization personnel	18	20.9	1	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
College professors	15	17.4	2	2.3	2	2.3	-	-	1	1.2
Others	3	3.5	1	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-professionals										
School board members	22	25.6	4	4.7	3	3.5	-	-	-	-
Parents	19	22.1	3	3.5	1	1.2	-	-	-	-
Students	17	19.8	4	4.7	1	1.2	2	2.3	-	-
Others	6	7.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Effects of the Minigrant Projects

The study investigated some of the effects of the minigrant projects on students, teachers and administrators associated with the recipient, teachers and administrators in other schools, clients (parents and school board members), as well as on the recipient himself. It should be remembered that the effects described here were reported by the recipient themselves.

1. Effects on students.

From the nature of the New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program it can be inferred that many of the minigrant projects were directly concerned with teaching pupils. However, projects which involved the development of resource materials or techniques of instruction, hence only indirectly concerned with teaching pupils, were also possible. Information on the number of projects directly and indirectly related to instructing pupils is found in Table 28. Seventy-five recipients said that their projects pertained directly to the instruction of pupils.

TABLE 28

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Direct and Indirect Focus on Students (N=86)

Type of focus on students	No. of projects	%
Direct instruction of students	71	82.5
Development of materials, techniques, etc.	11	12.8
Both direct instruction and development of materials, techniques, etc.	4	4.7
Total	86	100.0

Recipients estimated the numbers of students affected by their projects. These estimations are summarized in Table 29. Sixty-six of the recipients indicating that their projects directly involved teaching students estimated the numbers of students affected. Estimates ranged from three for one project to approximately 1400 for another. Approximately 8000 pupils were reported influenced in a direct way by the projects. The median estimated number of pupils directly affected by the 66 projects was 35. It appeared that at least half of the minigrant projects were aimed at influencing single groups of pupils the size of a class or smaller.

TABLE 29

Number of Minigrant Projects by Number of Students Affected and Direct or Indirect Focus on Students (N=85)[a]

Type of focus on students	Number of students affected 1-100	 101-200	 201-500	 501-1000	 Over 1000	Total
Direct instruction of students	61 (1687)[b]	5 (740)	7 (2660)	2 (1480)	1 (1400)	66 (7967)
Development of materials, techniques, etc.	5 (215)	1 (115)	2 (525)			8 (855)

[a] This number includes two recipients who reported that their projects concerned both direct instruction and developing materials, and estimated the numbers of pupils involved with each of these foci. The number also includes thirteen recipients who indicated they did not know the numbers of pupils affected by their projects.

[b] The figure in the parentheses represents the total estimated numbers of students affected by all of the projects in that classification.

Recipients' projects could have produced immediate, observable changes in pupils, or they could have involved changes occurring only at some future time. Data on the number of projects associated with immediate and long range changes in pupils are found in Table 30. As indicated in this table, 50 recipients saw their projects both resulting in immediate changes in students and having the potential for long range changes.

TABLE 30

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Time at Which Changes in Pupils Occur (N=80)

Time of change	No. of projects	%
Immediately	17	19.8
Long range	12	14.0
Both immediately and long range	50	58.1
No changes of these types	1	1.2
Total	80	93.1

In addition to the directness or indirectness of the effects of the minigrant projects on students, there is the substantive nature of the changes produced. Some changes in students which could have resulted from the projects involved understanding subject matter, performing a skill, understanding an aspect of oneself, and being able to relate more effectively to others. Table 31 provides information on the number of projects associated with each of these four substantive dimensions of pupil change. As indicated by this table, approximately two-fifths of the recipients reported that their projects were concerned with the single objective of increasing either pupils' knowledge of subject matter or their ability to perform a skill. Twenty-four recipients indicated that their projects involved two or more of the four types of change comprising this analysis.

TABLE 31

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by the Nature of Pupil Changes Resulting from the Projects (N=80)

Nature of pupil changes	No. of projects	%
Performing a skill	20	23.3
Knowing or understanding subject matter	15	17.4
Understanding oneself	8	9.3
Relating to others	5	5.8
Other	3	3.5
Knowing subject matter + performing a skill	6	7.0
Knowing subject matter + knowing oneself	2	2.3
Knowing subject matter + relating to others	1	1.2
Performing a skill + understanding oneself	2	2.3
Performing a skill + relating to others	2	2.3
Performing a skill + other	2	2.3
Understanding oneself + relating to others	2	2.3
Knowing subject matter + performing a skill + understanding oneself	2	2.3
Knowing subject matter + performing a skill + other	1	1.2
Knowing subject matter + understanding oneself + relating to others	1	1.2
Knowing subject matter + performing a skill + understanding oneself + relating to others	3	3.5
Project not designed to change pupil behavior	5	5.8
Total	80	93.0

Changes could have occurred in the rates at which pupils learned as a result of recipients' projects. Findings on the effects of the projects on pupils' learning rates are found in Table 32. Almost half of the recipients felt that their projects were not designed to produce any changes in the rates at which students learned. Twenty-five recipients reported detecting perceptible changes in pupils' learning rates resulting from their projects.

TABLE 32

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Effects of Projects on Pupils' Learning Rates
(N=77)

Effect on pupils' learning rates	No. of projects	%
Change in rate of learning	25	29.1
No change in rate of learning	1	1.2
Change in rate of learning unable to be determined	12	14.0
Project not designed to produce change in rate of learning	39	45.3
Total	77	89.6

2. Effects on Teachers and administrators.

Innovative ideas should enjoy wide application; the minigrant projects are no exception. One important effect of the recipients' projects, then, was their use by other teachers. The extent to which such use occurred is shown in Table 33. As indicated in this table, the greatest incidence of use took place among teachers in the recipients' teaching fields or grades in their own buildings. Forty-two recipients reported that their projects were being used by a total of 194 of their teaching area associates. Thirty-one of the 42 estimated their projects were being used by from one to five teachers. As the distance increased from the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings, the reported instances of use of the projects became less frequent. Twenty-nine of the group of 86 recipients could not provide any information about the use of their projects by other teachers.

TABLE 33

Number of Minigrant Projects by Category of Teacher and Number of Teachers Using the Projects
(N=57)[a]

	Number of teachers using project			
Category of teacher	1 - 5	6 -10	11 or more	Total
Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	31 (74)[b]	8 (60)	3 (60)	42 (194)
Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	14 (32)	1 (7)	7 (121)	22 (160)
Teachers in another building in recipient's school district	3 (4)	4 (30)	3 (135)	10 (169)
Teachers in another school district	6 (11)	- -	1 (45)	7 (56)

---

[a] Seven recipients indicated other teachers were using their projects but could give no estimates of the numbers involved.

[b] The figure in the parentheses represents the total estimated numbers of teachers using the project in that classification.

Thirty-three of the 45 administrators reported that other teachers were using the recipients' projects. Twenty-six administrators cited use of the projects by a total of 132 teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings; 21 mentioned that 171 teachers in different teaching areas in the recipients' buildings were using the projects; seven knew about the use of the projects by 214 different teachers in other buildings in their school districts; five indicated that 29 teachers in other districts were using the projects. Administrators tended to see proportionately greater use of the minigrant projects by other teachers than did recipients.

In addition to estimating the number of teachers who used their projects, recipients evaluated this use. These evaluations ranged from a level where the teacher incorporated important aspects of the project into his own teaching to a level where the teacher showed some interest in relatively unimportant facets of the project without using the project in his work. Forty-nine of the 57 recipients who indicated other teachers were using their projects evaluated this use. The results of the recipients' appraisal of the use of their projects by other teachers are found in Table 34. The findings in Table 34 suggest that teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings tended to make active use of the projects. On the contrary, teachers in different teaching areas in the recipients' buildings apparently used the projects much more passively; 16 of the 24 recipients reporting teachers in this category using their projects indicated that the teachers seemed interested in important aspects of the projects but did not use them in their work.

Of the administrators who reported on the use of the recipients' projects by other teachers, 10 indicated that teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings had incorporated important aspects of the projects into their work, while 11 said that teachers in the same category were interested in the projects but were not using them. Eight administrators reported that teachers in different teaching areas in the recipients' buildings were actually using important aspects of the projects in their work, while eight said that teachers in the same category only showed interest in the projects.

TABLE 34

Number of Minigrant Projects by Category of Teacher Using the Project and Evaluation of the Use (N=49)

Category of teacher	Evaluation of use: Project incorporated into teacher's work	Interest shown in important aspects of project, but no use of it	Unimportant aspects of project incorporated into teacher's work	Interest in unimportant aspects of project, but no use of it
Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	24	14	1	1
Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	7	16	1	-
Teachers in another building in recipient's school district	5	5	-	-
Teachers in another school district	2	2	-	-

The study also investigated the value of the projects for stimulating other teachers to be innovative. Recipients indicated changes in innovation occurring following the implementing of the minigrant projects for each of four categories of teachers. Changes in innovation could range from a marked increase in trying new ideas to a decline in both interest in and attempts at trying new ideas. The findings for this investigation, based on 58 recipients, appear in Table 35. As indicated in this table, recipients seemed most aware of what happened in their own buildings, especially in their immediate teaching areas. Thirty-three recipients reported instances of marked or mild increase in trying new ideas on the part of those in their teaching areas in their buildings. A substantial number of recipients, 28, showed lack of awareness of the effects of their projects on the innovative efforts of their fellow teachers.

Information about the recipients' knowledge of the level of innovation in schools prior to the initiation of the minigrant projects was obtained to help evaluate the findings on the projects as stimuli for teacher innovation. Data on the prior level of innovation, based on 49 of the 58 recipients represented in Table 35, is found in Table 36. A summary of the ratings in this table suggests that recipients saw teachers, especially those in their buildings, at least sometimes attempting new ideas before the minigrant projects. Any increases in teacher innovation reported in Table 35 probably do not build on a total absence of this behavior.

TABLE 35

Number of Minigrant Projects by Degree of Influence On Teacher Innovation and Category of Teacher (N=58)

Degree of influence on teacher innovation	Category of teacher: Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	Teachers in another building in recipient's school district	Teachers in another school district
Marked increase in trying new ideas	20	10	8	4
Marked increase in interest in trying new ideas without actual attempts	6	9	1	3
Mild increase in trying new ideas	13	9	6	-
Mild increase in interest in trying new ideas without actual attempts	5	5	1	1
No change in interest in or attempts at trying new ideas	10	10	3	1
Decline in interest in or attempts at trying new ideas	-	-	-	-

Thirty-four of the 45 administrators were able to give information about the effects of the recipients' projects on the innovative efforts of teachers. Eighteen administrators reported that there was mild or marked increase in trying out new ideas on the part of teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings; 17 reported the same thing for teachers in other teaching areas in recipients' buildings. Administrators saw very few effects of the projects on teacher innovation outside recipients' buildings.

Administrators also reported that teachers in recipients' buildings at least sometimes, if not frequently, used new ideas in their teaching before the minigrants.

TABLE 36

Number of Recipients Reporting Innovation Prior to Minigrants by Category of Teacher and Extent of Innovation
(N=49)

Category of teacher	Extent of innovation Frequently	 Sometimes	 Seldom or never
Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	18	25	3
Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	10	25	1
Teachers in another building in recipient's school district	4	15	1
Teacher in another school district	2	6	-

The effects of the projects on interest in applying for minigrants was examined in the study. Applying for a minigrant in itself has little value. What is important is the professional cognitive activity represented by a minigrant application. This activity includes conceiving a new idea and shaping it for use in changing pupils' behavior. The act of applying for the minigrant produces a written articulation of the teacher's idea together with plans for its use in the classroom.

The degree of interest in applying for a minigrant could range from the actual writing of proposals to a decline in interest in writing proposals. Findings on the stimulus value of minigrant projects for increasing teachers' attempts at and interest in applying for minigrants appear in Table 37. The findings in Table 37 are based on 69 recipients. As revealed in this table, recipients reported some interest among teachers in applying for minigrants as a result of the projects. Eighteen recipients reported that teachers in their teaching areas in their buildings were writing proposals, while 30 recipients indicated similar information for teachers in different teaching areas in their buildings. In addition, 18 recipients said they knew that teachers in other buildings in their districts were writing proposals. Recipients appeared less aware of teachers interested in writing proposals than they were of teachers who were actually in the process of applying for minigrants.

TABLE 37

Number of Projects by Degree of
Influence on Minigrant Applications and Category of Teacher
(N=69)

Degree of influence on minigrant applications	Category of teacher Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	Teachers in another building in recipient's school district	Teachers in another school district
Proposals actually written for submission to State Department of Education	18	30	18	7
Strong interest in writing proposals	12	7	3	1
Mild increase in writing proposals	6	8	3	1
Little or no interest in writing proposals	12	8	4	-
Decrease in interest in writing proposals	-	-	-	-

To evaluate the findings on the projects as stimuli for generating teachers' attempts at and interest in applying for minigrants, information was sought on the status of teachers' interest in minigrants prior to the recipients' obtaining their awards. This information, which was available for 61 of the 69 recipients represented in Table 37,is found in Table 38. The findings in Table 38 suggest that recipients saw other teachers' interest in minigrants at a low level prior to their obtaining grants. Thus, increases in teachers' attempts at or interest in applying for minigrants attributed by recipients to their projects began from a point of little or no interest.

Thirty-two of the 45 administrators provided information about the effects of the projects on teachers' applying for minigrants. Eleven administrators reported instances of proposals being written by teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings. Sixteen and nine administrators indicated similar instances for teachers in other teaching areas in recipients' buildings and in other buildings in their school districts respectively.

While some of the administrators indicated a low level of teacher interest in applying for minigrants prior to the recipients' projects, there were also reports of medium interest. For example, 17 administrators said there was low interest among teachers in the recipients' teaching areas in their buildings in applying for minigrants before the projects but 14 said there was medium interest. Similarly, 17 administrators saw low interest on the part of teachers in different teaching areas in recipients' buildings, while 15 saw medium interest.

TABLE 38

Number of Recipients Reporting Interest in Applying for Minigrants Prior to Recipients' Minigrants by Category of Teacher and Amount of Interest (N=61)

	Amount of interest in applying for minigrants		
Category of teacher	High	Medium	Low
Teachers in the same teaching area in recipient's building	4	9	44
Teachers in a different teaching area in recipient's building	8	8	37
Teachers in another building in recipient's school district	2	9	22
Teachers in another school district	2	3	8

The study examined some effects of the minigrant projects on administrative personnel. One effect involved the extent which recipients saw their projects influencing administrators' behavior in encouraging teachers to attempt new ideas in the classroom. This administrative behavior could range from a marked increase in attempts to produce teacher innovation to a decrease in interest in or attempts at getting teachers to use new ideas. The results of the investigation of the effects of the projects on administrative encouragement of teacher innovation are presented in Table 39. The findings in Table 39 are based on 60 recipients. Thirty-nine recipients reported that as a result of their projects they noticed either marked or mild increases in administrators' efforts in their buildings to increase teacher innovation. Twenty-one recipients reported similar increases in the efforts of central office administrators to stimulate teacher innovation.

The role of the minigrant projects in increasing administrative encouragement of teacher innovation in classrooms was judged against the level of administrative performance of this task prior to the start of the recipients' projects. Information on the amount of administrative encouragement of innovation prior to the minigrant projects is contained in Table 40. The data in Table 40 are based on 57 of the 60 recipients represented in Table 39. The results in Table 40 suggest that recipients saw their building administrators, and to a somewhat lesser degree central office administrators, frequently urging teachers to try new ideas in their classrooms prior to the development of the minigrant projects. The increase in administrative encouragement of innovation reported by recipients was superimposed on fairly strong efforts in this direction already.

TABLE 39

Number of Projects by Degree of Influence on Administrative Encouragement of Teacher Innovation and Category of Administrator

(N=60)

Degree of influence on administrative encouragement of teacher innovation	Category of administrator			
	Administrator in recipient's building	Administrator in another building in recipient's school district	Administrator in central office	Administrator in another school district
Marked increase in attempts to get teachers to try new ideas	26	9	14	1
Marked increase in interest in getting teachers to try new ideas, without actual encouragement	3	6	4	1
Mild increase in attempts to get teachers to try new ideas	13	5	7	1
Mild increase in interest in getting teachers to try new ideas, without actual encouragement	2	2	2	2
No change in interest in or attempts at getting teachers to try new ideas	8	7	8	2
Decrease in interest in or attempts at getting teachers to try new ideas	-	-	-	-

Thirty-eight of the 45 administrators furnished information concerning administrative encouragement of teacher innovation resulting from the minigrant projects. Seventeen administrators reported marked increase in the attempts of building administrators to encourage teachers to try new ideas in their classrooms; eight mentioned mild increase in such encouragement on the part of building principals. The administrators, who were mostly building principals themselves, reported negligible increase in encouragement on the part of central office administrators in other buildings in their districts.

Twenty-eight administrators indicated that building administrators frequently encouraged teacher innovation prior to the minigrants, while 18 saw central office administrators as frequently encouraging teacher innovation before the minigrant projects. The data from administrators tended to support the reports of recipients on administrative encouragement of teacher innovation prior to the minigrant projects.

TABLE 40

Number of Recipients Reporting Administrative Encouragement of Teacher Innovation Prior to Minigrants by Category of Administrator and Extent of Encouragement (N=57)

	Extent of administrative encouragement of teacher innovation		
Category of administrator	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom or never
Administrator in recipient's building	29	18	9
Administrator in another building in recipient's school district	7	11	5
Administrator in central office	18	18	3
Administrator in another school district	1	4	1

A second influence on administrators investigated in the study concerned the effect of the projects on administrative efforts to get teachers to apply for minigrants. Any type of award, including a grant, reflects to the credit of a school and its district. Administrators, conscious of public relations, were presumably aware of the value of minigrants. Administrative behavior influencing the production of minigrant applications could range from a marked increase in attempts to get teachers to apply for minigrants to a decrease in interest in or attempts at urging teachers to seek these awards. Findings concerning recipients' perceptions of administrators' efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants following the start of the projects are shown in Table 41. This table reveals that 35 recipients saw either a marked or mild increase in their building administrators' attempts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants. Similar behavior on the part of central office administrators was reported by 23 recipients.

TABLE 41

Number of Projects by Degree of Administrative Encouragement of Minigrant Applications and Category of Administrator (N=62)

Degree of administrative encouragement of minigrant applications	Category of administrator			
	Administrator in recipient's building	Administrator in another building in recipient's school district	Administrator in central office	Administrator in another school district
Marked increase in attempts to get teachers to apply for minigrants	21	8	15	1
Marked increase in interest in getting teachers to apply for minigrants, without actual encouragement	4	5	6	2
Mild increase in attempts to get teachers to apply for minigrants	14	6	8	1
Mild increase in interest in getting teachers to apply for minigrants, without actual encouragement	4	2	-	-
No change in interest in or attempts at getting teachers to apply for minigrants	10	5	8	1
Decrease in interest in or attempts at getting teachers to apply for minigrants	-	-	-	-

The influence of projects on increasing administrative encouragement of teachers to apply for minigrants was weighed against the level of administrative performance of this task before the approval of the recipients' projects. Findings concerning the earlier degree of administrative encouragement, based on 53 of the 62 recipients represented in Table 41, appear in Table 42. From the results in Table 42, twice as many recipients saw their building administrators seldom encouraging teachers to apply for minigrants as saw them either frequently or sometimes encouraging teachers to do so. On the other hand, there were as many recipients who reported central office administrators either frequently or sometimes encouraging minigrant applications as who reported them seldom encouraging such activity.

Thirty-eight of the 45 administrators furnished data on the effects of the projects on administrative encouragement of teachers to apply for minigrants. Twenty-five administrators said marked increase in encouragement of minigrant applications by administrators in recipients' buildings occurred following the projects; nine administrators reported similar information for central office administrators. Seven administrators reported mild increase in encouraging minigrants on the part of central office administrators.

Eighteen administrators reported building administrators frequently encouraged minigrant applications prior to the recipients' projects, while 10 said building administrators sometimes encouraged teachers to apply for minigrants, and six said building administrators seldom or never did, before the projects. Administrators indicated many more central office administrators who frequently or sometimes encouraged minigrant applications prior to the recipients' projects than who seldom did. The data from the administrators disagreed with those obtained from the recipients, who saw administrative encouragement of minigrant applications at a relatively lower level before the recipients' projects.

TABLE 42

Number of Recipients Reporting Administrative Encouragement of Minigrant Applications Prior to Recipients' Minigrants by Category of Administrator and Extent of Encouragement
(N=53)

	Extent of administrative encouragement of minigrant applications		
Category of administrator	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom or never
Administrator in recipient's building	13	12	24
Administrator in another building in recipient's school district	4	6	15
Administrator in central office	14	12	10
Administrator in another school district	-	1	2

3. Effects on parents and school board members.

Clients' knowledge and evaluation of what occurs in their children's schools play an important role in the efficient operation of a school system. Financial support, and of equal importance and greater probability, attitudinal support, are more likely to be forthcoming when parents and school board members know and approve what their schools are doing. It is the attitudinal support which helps to prevent dissension and the accompanying morale problems which eventually cut schools into corridors of ineffectiveness. Minigrant projects, as fairly unique activities, could influence clients' attitudes toward their schools. Consequently, the study sought information from recipients concerning parents' and school board members' knowledge and feelings about minigrant projects.

The knowledge and feelings of school board members could range from a thorough and enthusiastic acquaintance with a recipient's project to complete ignorance or a negative view of the project. A school board which found merit in a particular project, or in this means of encouraging new approaches in classrooms, could authorize funds to continue the project and/or initiate others which have merit. Findings from recipients' reports of the effects of their projects on boards of education are summarized in Table 43. Thirteen recipients indicated that board members' interest in their projects extended to the point of local fiscal assistance for the continuation of these projects and/or the initiation of other projects; 20 recipients reported that boards of education showed little or no interest in their projects. Nineteen recipients admitted that they were not aware of what school boards knew and felt about their projects.

TABLE 43

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects
by the Type of Effect on School Boards
(N-59)[a]

Type of effect on school boards	No. of projects	%
Financial support voted to continue the project and/or initiate others	13	15.1
Strong interest in the project, but not to the extent of financial support	20	23.3
Mild interest in the project	2	2.3
No interest in the project	20	23.3
Little or nothing is known about the project by the board	4	4.7
Total	59	68.7

[a] An additional 19 recipients reported they were not aware of what school boards knew about their projects.

Forty-four of the forty-five administrators reported the feelings of school boards toward recipients' minigrant projects. Eight administrators indicated that school boards in their districts had decided to continue financial support to the recipients' projects and/or to extend support to new projects; 11 administrators reported keen interest on the part of their boards in recipients' projects. However, 15 administrators admitted that, while their boards knew about the projects, they had not expressed interest one way or the other in them.

Parents' knowledge and feelings about minigrant projects could range from a depth of interest which included a desire to see the projects continued or expanded to complete ignorance of or negative feelings toward the projects. Findings from recipients' reports of the effects of their projects on parents are contained in Table 44. Twenty-six recipients indicated that parents wished to see their projects continued or expanded; only seven recipients reported that parents had no interest in their projects. Seven recipients said that parents were not aware of their projects.

Forty-four of the forty-five administrators in the study supplied data on the effects of recipients' projects on parents. Ten administrators reported that parents were so impressed with the projects that they wished them continued or expanded. Twelve administrators indicated parents expressed no interest in the projects, while seven administrators admitted they were unaware of what parents knew about the projects.

In comparing recipients' reports of the effects of their projects on school board members with those on parents, there seemed to be more positive interest and support from parents than from board members. One factor which might help to account for this difference in interest concerns school boards' fiscal responsibilities. Expressions of strong enthusiasm on the part of board members would be expected to be followed by financial support. The attitudes toward taxes prevalent in most communities invariably cause boards of education to be cautious about anything which might result in tax increases above tolerable limits. Board members may tend to be non-committal or even reserved toward activities which can increase the costs of operating schools.

TABLE 44

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects
by the Type of Effect on Parents
(N=65)[a]

Type of effect on parents	No. of projects	%
Interest in seeing the project continued or expanded	26	30.2
Strong interest in the project, but not to the point of wanting it continued	12	14.0
Mild interest in the project	13	15.1
No interest in the project	7	8.1
Little or nothing is known about the project by parents	7	8.1
Total	65	75.5

[a] An additional 13 recipients reported they were not aware of what parents knew about their projects.

4. Effects on the minigrant recipient.

Obtaining a minigrant could affect a recipient's professional behavior in at least three ways. First, the minigrant, as an award, could draw attention to the individual receiving it. This attention focuses in part on the recipient's professional skills and knowledge related to the project recognized by the award. The resulting communications situation could lead to increased contacts between the recipient and professionals and clients, for the purpose of transmitting information about the project. The contacts could be informal, e.g., an encounter in the hall or in the faculty room, or they may be formal, e.g., a scheduled faculty or PTA meeting. Increasing contacts in order to communicate professional information may be an important stage both in breaking down the walls of isolation which have long been characteristic of teaching and in enhancing the professional status of teachers.

Second, receiving a minigrant is more than getting an award; it is a professional achievement as well. As a professional achievement, it has potential for strengthening the identity of the recipient with teaching as a professional endeavor. Two traditional indices of professional behavior include the amount of professional reading one does and the quality of one's associations with organizations formed to foster certain types of life work. It was possible for a minigrant to influence the recipient's professional reading and his relationships with professional organizations.

Third, obtaining a minigrant could raise the general level of innovation in a recipient's teaching. It could serve as a release mechanism which enables the recipient to multiply his new idea output.

Information concerning the effects of the minigrants on recipients' contacts with professionals and clients, their professional reading, their role in professional organizations, and the level of innovation in their teaching are presented in Table 45. A sizable group of recipients reported some increase in their informal contacts with teachers, administrators, and parents, with the largest number indicating increases in contacts with administrators. With the exception of teachers, however, the projects resulted in very little increase in formal contacts with professionals and clients. Most recipients reported no change in their contacts with school board members. Thirty-five recipients reported increases in their professional reading, while 22 said they increased their attendance at professional meetings following their projects. The largest group of recipients, 64, indicated some or great increase in trying out new ideas in their classrooms as a result of the minigrants. The projects were reported as having only minor influence on recipients' membership or leadership in professional organizations. It should be noted that, despite the changes mentioned above, the largest numbers of recipients reported no change in their professional behavior for the variables investigated, with the exception of innovating in the classroom.

TABLE 45

Number of Recipients Reporting Changes in Professional Behavior
After Obtaining Minigrants by Type of
Professional Behavior and Degree of Change
(N=82)

Type of professional behavior	Degree of change Increased greatly	Increased some	No Change	Declined come	Declined greatly
Contacts with teachers					
Informal	11	28	40	-	1
Formal	3	29	35	1	1
Contacts with administrators					
Informal	6	38	33	1	1
Formal	4	11	45	1	-
Contacts with school board members					
Informal	6	8	61	1	-
Formal	2	7	50	-	-
Contacts with parents					
Informal	10	25	43	-	-
Formal	9	13	42	-	-
Reading professional literature	10	34	32	-	-
Membership in professional organizations	2	8	63	-	-
Leadership in professional organizations	2	6	63	1	1
Attending professional meetings	3	19	50	-	1
Trying new ideas in the classroom	25	39	14	-	-

Thirty-eight of the 45 administrators participating in the study indicated changes in the professional behavior of recipients in their schools, employing the same dimensions of behavior used by recipients in reporting about themselves. Information on the administrators' appraisal of the recipients' professional behavior is summarized in Table 46. The data provided by the administrators about the recipients in general mirror the data provided by the recipients themselves. Administrators tended to see proportionately greater increase in contacts between recipients and school board members than did recipients. Administrators, as did recipients, indicated that recipients increased their attempts at classroom innovation as a result of the minigrant projects.

TABLE 46

Number of Recipients by Type of Professional Behavior
and Degree of Change Reported by Administrators
(N=38)

Type of professional behavior	Degree of change reported by administrators				
	Increased greatly	Increased some	No change	Decreased some	Decreased greatly
Contacts with teachers					
Informal	5	17	14	-	-
Formal	2	16	9	-	-
Contacts with administrators					
Informal	7	18	11	1	-
Formal	2	9	8	-	-
Contacts with school board members					
Informal	1	9	18	-	-
Formal	1	8	15	-	-
Contacts with parents					
Informal	2	18	12	1	-
Formal	1	13	8	1	-
Reading professional literature	6	7	9	-	-
Membership in professional organizations	-	3	18	1	-
Leadership in professional organizations	1	2	19	-	-
Attending professional meetings	5	6	14	1	-
Trying new ideas in the classroom	14	15	4	-	-

The effects of the minigrants on recipients were also examined through an open-ended question. Recipients had an opportunity to respond in writing to a question regarding what obtaining a minigrant meant to them. Seventy of the 86 recipients replied to this question. Invariably, recipients related the professional satisfaction that obtaining the minigrant had given them. Not only did recipients feel that minigrants brought recognition to their teaching, but that the awards extended their teaching by enabling them to do a more effective job in the classroom.

One theme running through the accounts of satisfaction mentioned by the recipients concerned the importance of the minigrants for obtaining the materials or equipment around which projects centered. Thirty-four of the 70 recipients responding to the open-ended question made some reference to materials or equipment. Having materials or equipment allowed recipients not only to implement their projects but to fulfill their professional obligation to instruct students. One recipient, a high school teacher, wrote the following:

> "The time-sharing equipment provided by the minigrant gave us access to a computer.... Having this facility in school benefitted the class, first of all, because they did not have to wait several days to edit programs. Secondly, it was revealing to a number of faculty members, particularly those in science and math who had had no prior experience with computers. Finally, many students in math classes were introduced to the surprising computer capabilities."

Another recipient from the high school level said it this way:

> "Simply stated, the award of the minigrant has enabled my group to participate in activities which we might not have been able to do. For example, we purchased a tape recorder and were able to clarify ideas by listening to former "sessions". It was a very handy "tool" in any situation."

An elementary teacher stated the following:

> "The minigrant has given me an opportunity to work with my children in a new way which I believe has enlivened and enriched their beginning reading program. It has also led me to some new learnings in using equipment (for example, the tape recorder itself was not new to me, but the cassette type of recorder was, and so was the listening station).... Of course, the minigrant also meant that I was able to obtain excellent equipment which probably never would have been included in our regular budget for instructional supplies. The cassette recorder and listening stations will be useful for many years and in many ways beyond those envisioned in the original proposal."

The protocol material cited above provides some indication of the importance of the minigrants for getting materials or equipment for the recipients. However, in each instance, the goal of the recipient was not merely to obtain the materials. The materials were a means by which recipients could extend and enrich their services to pupils.

Dissemination of information about minigrant projects.

The minigrant projects needed to be communicated to others for widespread effects to occur. If professionals, for example, remained uninformed of the nature and the results of the projects, there was no way for these projects to influence their teaching. The teacher as a change agent using the medium of the minigrant project was highly dependent on communications machinery. Consequently, the study sought information from the recipients regarding the means by which the results of their projects were transmitted to others.

Two ways of communicating information about the projects were speaking and writing. The speaking and writing could be done by the recipient himself or by others, including professionals, e.g., teachers or administrators, or non-professionals, e.g., newspaper reporters. In addition, the communication could be informal, e.g., conversation in a faculty room, or formal, e.g., a report at a faculty meeting. Written reports could be published or unpublished. The dissemination of information about the recipients' projects was investigated within the context of the dimensions of communication mentioned above.

Findings concerning ways the results of the minigrant projects were communicated to teachers appear in Table 47. As indicated in this table, information about recipients' projects tended to be disseminated to teachers by oral rather than written means. One striking exception to this oral emphasis concerned the 50 projects for which accounts appeared in newspapers serving the communities in which the recipients' schools were located.

Informal contacts with teachers, in which recipients talked about their projects, comprised the most frequently reported oral means of dissemination. In addition, there were 52 instances reported in which administrators in recipients' buildings informed teachers orally about the projects.

Forty-nine recipients indicated that teachers originated requests for information about their projects. Teachers were able to learn about seven of the projects through the radio program Speaking of Schools, produced through the cooperation of the New Jersey Education Association and the New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers. With respect to written communication, only 12 recipients said they prepared written reports of their projects which were available to teachers.

TABLE 47

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Means of Communication of Results to Teachers (N=85)

Means of communication to teachers	No. of projects	%
Oral Means		
Teacher originated request for information	49	57.0
Recipient volunteered information in informal contacts	68	79.1
Administrator in recipient's building informed teachers about his project	52	60.5
Administrator in central office informed teachers about the project	36	41.9
Recipient described his project at formal faculty meetings	30	34.9
Another teacher informed teachers about the project	30	34.9
Recipient provided information about his project at meetings of professional organizations	18	20.9
Other oral means	16	18.6
Written Means		
Report appearing in local papers	50	58.1
Report appearing in a professional publication	16	18.6
Unpublished report prepared by recipient	12	14.0
Unpublished report prepared by administrator in recipient's building	9	10.5
Unpublished report prepared by administrator in central office	9	10.5
Other written means	16	18.6

Findings on ways information about recipients' projects was communicated to parents and school board members are found in Table 48. As indicated in this table, recipients cited oral means of conveying information to parents and school board members much more often than written means. The most frequently mentioned means of disseminating information orally to parents was informal contact between parents and recipients, reported for 39 projects. While 28 recipients reported that they informed school board members about minigrant projects through informal contacts, 33 recipients indicated that central office administrators provided information orally to board members. The principal written means of informing both parents and board members seemed to be magazine or newspaper articles prepared by laymen. Fourteen recipients indicated that they had written unpublished reports about their projects which came to the attention of school board members; a similar number of recipients indicated parents were informed by published reports which recipients had originated. School board members learned about 13 of the projects through published reports prepared by recipients.

TABLE 48

Number and Percentage of Minigrant Projects by Means of Communication of Results to Clients and Category of Client

Means of communication to clients	Client			
	Parents (N=69)		School Board Members (N=72)	
	No. of projects	%	No. of projects	%
Oral Means				
Parent or board member originated requests for information about project	12	14.0	5	5.8
Recipient conveyed information about project in informal contacts	39	45.3	28	32.6
Recipient described project in formal presentations	16	18.6	12	14.0
Administrator in central office provided information about project	14	16.3	33	38.4
Administrator in recipient's building conveyed information about project	11	12.8	20	23.3
Another teacher reported results of project	7	8.1	3	3.5
Other oral means	5	5.8	3	3.5
Written Means				
Magazine or newspaper article prepared by layman	19	22.1	17	19.8
Report originated by recipient				
Unpublished	5	5.8	14	16.3
Published	14	16.3	13	15.1
Report originated by building administrator				
Unpublished	1	1.2	3	3.5
Published	6	7.0	5	5.8
Article prepared by a non-public school professional educator	2	2.3	5	5.8
Report originated by central office administrator				
Unpublished	1	1.2	3	3.5
Published	1	1.2	4	4.7
Report originated by another teacher				
Unpublished	-	-	-	-
Published	-	-	3	3.5
Other written means	7	8.1	8	9.3

Chapter IV

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

In Chapter I, the New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program was characterized as a strategy for effecting educational change. Specifically, the Program made funds up to $1,000 available in the form of minigrants to classroom teachers in New Jersey public schools to enable them to implement innovative ideas about teaching. The recipients of these minigrants in accomplishing their projects acted as agents of any change resulting from the operation of the total strategy.

Selected characteristics of the recipient-change agents from the 1968-69 New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program were described in Chapter III, together with characteristics of the origin and development of their projects. The findings in Chapter III can be synthesized to produce a composite portrait of the recipient-change agent resulting from the grants made possible in 1968-69. The picture suggested by these findings is of a person who may be of either sex and who probably is mature in years.

This person is an experienced, certificated teacher enjoying tenure in his school district, where he may teach at either the elementary or junior-high school level. The traditional indices of professionalism in teaching are particularly applicable to him. He likely owns a master's degree, but regardless of his degree status he has actively pursued formal higher education. He joins teacher organizations at local, state, and, frequently, national levels; he may serve his local organization in some leadership capacity. In addition, he probably belongs to one or more professional associations specifically related to his teaching interests. He reads professionally beyond, for example, what is required in college courses. While he is teaching now, he anticipates moving to an administrative or specialized staff position in the near future.

The recipient not only perceives himself to be innovative in introducing new content, trying new methods, and using different materials in his teaching, but teaches in a school where the administration encourages innovation. He sees his innovation as a creature of his own thinking, while the innovation of his colleagues is seen as either direct borrowing, or modified borrowing, from others. In addition to relying on his own thinking to guide his teaching, he obtains cues from pupils' interests. However, suggestions from parents and administrators, and procedures emphasized in college courses in teacher education have considerably less admitted influence on his teaching. The more widely-acknowledged tasks associated with teaching such as selecting instructional goals, presenting content, and preparing learning materials appeal more to him than such tasks as guiding pupils' social-emotional development and evaluating teaching-learning.

While the recipient remains inner-directed as far as ideas for teaching are concerned, he does seek assistance when needed, relying on building administrators and supervisors, central office personnel, and teachers in his subject or grade area. The field of his professional interactions is limited mostly to his own building, especially to his own teaching area; he has little or no contact with teachers in other buildings in his school district or in other districts. The professional world of the recipient is comprised of his students and him.

Chapter III revealed a number of effects of recipients' projects on other professionals (teachers and administrators), clients (parents and school board members), and the recipient-change agent himself. The effects of the minigrant projects on teachers appear relatively modest. The use of the projects by others seemed restricted to the recipients' buildings, and especially to the recipients' teaching areas within these buildings. For example, as reported in Chapter III, 42 recipients indicated a total of 194 teachers in their teaching areas and their buildings were using something from the projects; 22 recipients said that 160 teachers from different teaching areas in their buildings were using some aspect of the projects. There is little evidence to suggest that the use of the projects extended much beyond the recipients' school buildings. This conclusion is supported by the reports of the 45 administrators cooperating in the study, a group which had some opportunity to know about any wide utilization of the projects elsewhere.

The number of teachers using the projects is one thing, the nature of this use is quite another. As indicated in Chapter III, the minigrant recipients' evaluation of the use of their projects by others ranged from incorporation of important aspects of the projects into teachers' own work to interest in unimportant aspects of the projects. Since many of the projects involved materials or equipment, the inclusion of some important aspect of a project into a teacher's work could as easily have been the use of one or more of the materials as the development of spinoffs from the basic concepts or principles undergirding a project.

Of the 20 projects visited by the investigator, only three gave evidence of being used by other teachers. Two of the three were designed to be used by other teachers. Each of the three was in use or was soon to be used in other buildings in the district in addition to the recipients' buildings. The use by teachers in the recipient's building of the one project of the three not specifically designed for others seemed to consist largely of borrowing materials from the recipient.

The effects of the minigrant projects on teacher innovation and teachers' applying for minigrants, on administrative encouragement of teacher innovation and teachers' applying for minigrants, and on school board support for teacher innovation appear equally moderate. This is not to minimize the importance of changes which occurred in any of these areas as a result of a given recipient's minigrant. Indeed, the fact that 13 recipients reported that their school boards decided to lend some financial support to the projects and/or to additional teacher innovation is an achievement of consequence, particularly for the individual districts where this occurred. That for one of the 20 projects visited by the investigator there was evidence the project resulted in marked increase in community interest and cooperation with the school and its educational program is an accomplishment of note. However, the number of recipients reporting various external effects for their projects and the number of external effects observed in visits to projects remain small, and, therefore, the influence of the projects on other professionals and clients (school board members and parents) must be considered modest.

The study found the spoken word to be the principal means of disseminating information about the projects. Specifically, information seemed to be communicated mostly through informal conversations between recipients and teachers and through oral exchanges between building administrators and teachers. Informal oral communication within a school is not conducive to wide dispersal of information, a condition which may help to account for the restricted spread of effects of the minigrant projects.

The only substantial form of written dissemination of information about the projects seemed to be articles in local newspapers. Again, unless a newspaper has wide circulation, its value for informing others who ought to know about the projects is severely limited. For the content of the projects to have broad impact requires more powerful means of informing teachers than the simple types of oral communication revealed in the study.

The effects of the projects on students are quite difficult to judge, since learning is an individual matter. The study was not able to focus on behavior changes occurring with specific pupils. The investigator did talk extensively with pupils in 10 of the 20 projects visited. Some very significant changes in interests, attitudes, and values as well as in skills and knowledge probably took place in many pupils connected with the projects. For example, a small group of high school students became aware of the problems of blacks in the inner city; some elementary and junior high school students enjoyed school, possibly for the first time; some high school students recognized new vocational options. In general, the projects had considerable impact on students.

The most significant effects of the minigrant projects were on the recipients themselves. These effects, which were internal, involved professional self-actualization. Much of the evidence for this conclusion was derived from conversations with recipients, pupils, and administrators during the visits to 20 of the projects, and from responses to unstructured items in the recipient's and the administrator's questionnaires.

The recipients did not become excellent teachers because they received minigrants. To the contrary, the recipients obtained minigrants because they were good teachers in the first place. Administrators generally praised recipients highly. One administrator said about a recipient:

> "He's a great teacher. I wish I had a million like him."

Another stated:

> "She is one of the finest teachers in this school."

Examples of other remarks included the following:

> "It (the recipient's obtaining a minigrant) confirmed my opinion of the teacher, which was that she was a superior teacher."
>
> "It (the minigrant) provided recognition to an outstanding teacher."
>
> "The awarding of a minigrant to...encouraged a fine teacher to improve a service she had already put into effect."

The minigrant made it possible for the recipient to raise his teaching to a higher level of effectiveness, chiefly by permitting him to implement an idea he had been harboring but was unable to do much about because it required funds that the school district was either unwilling or unable to allocate to a single teacher and classroom. The evidence in the study is strong that recipients sought minigrants to get materials and equipment obtainable in no other way.

Effective teaching, of course, does not necessarily demand elaborate equipment or materials. Similarly, innovation in teaching can occur without involving costly materials or apparatus. It is conceivable that many teachers with innovative ideas did not apply for minigrants because their plans required little money for implementation. Any type of grant system such as the New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program may be inadequate for recognizing and encouraging innovation of this type.

Nevertheless, the drive to transcend himself through technological appendages comprises one of the distinctive motive patterns of Western man. The human eye has its limits; however, man has been able to extend his organ of sight by developing the microscope and the telescope. It is not unexpected, then, to find mirrored in the classroom the same interest in materials and technology found in the larger fabric of the culture. There is nothing unusual about teachers wanting to extend their instruction through the use of the most effective materials and technology extant.

Given the high level of technological sophistication prevalent in the culture, it is ironic to note that relative barrenness of schools and classrooms with respect to materials and equipment. When equipment is available, the requisite accessories for maximizing its usefulness are frequently absent. A school may have a camera, but since there is no money to purchase film the camera can't be used; a school may have access to a computer, but the funds provided to buy time permit the computer to be used with only a few students.

Seventeen of the 20 recipients visited by the investigator acquired materials or equipment in connection with their projects. The comments of the recipients indicated that these materials and equipment made it possible to do a better job of teaching students, or stated another way, to give more effective professional service to clients.

Providing more effective instruction to pupils is one level of professional self-actualization. Some recipients, however, gave evidence of moving in the direction of a second level. This second level of professional self-actualization is intensely personal and involves the recipient's inner feelings toward himself in relation to his life's work derived from satisfactions from teaching young people and seeing changes take place in their personalities.

Witness for a deeper level of professional awareness is found in the comments of some recipients about their minigrant projects. One elementary teacher said the following:

> "It has helped to make my teaching more honest. I feel as though I am really reaching my children on their level and giving them genuine learning experiences, rather than spoon-feeding them."

A second elementary described her feelings this way:

> "More important, however, has been the thrill of watching new attitudes and new concepts slowly taking shape in young minds. It has been the witnessing of sustained enthusiasm for learning beyond the love of a good grade, but instead to satisfy a curiosity. It has been the recognition of the value, on the part of parents in a conservative community, of a new approach to learning. To a great extent I think my reward has been the personal one of seeing a theory on paper become a successful reality while learning new techniques and gaining new insights."

Another elementary teacher reacted in the following manner:

> "Although it was not anticipated by me in writing up my proposal, the greatest beneficiary may very well be me. There have been so many beautiful scenes to behold in the relationship between the Aide and the children, I am constantly learning from my association with him. He has helped me to better understand what it means to be Black; helped me to improve my relationships with parents; helped me to make my lessons more meaningful; and most of all, helped me to learn humility and to value a human being for whatever he is, rather than what he might someday become."

A high school teacher spoke as follows:

> "To have a meaningful project funded by the State is one of the most significant events of my career. The talking, planning, and carrying through of my project was a tremendous learning experience for me. The project itself provided my students with an education they could not have obtained in any other way.

Recommendations

The New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program invites teachers to formulate new ideas about teaching and provides funds for putting these ideas into action in classrooms. The study revealed that a number of changes did occur when teachers' new ideas were given financial support in the form of minigrants.

At least two types of change are associated with the stimulation of classroom teachers through external recognition in the form of minigrants. One type of change concerns the influences of the innovative projects on others, as well as on the teacher-recipient himself. The results of the study of the 1968-69 minigrant recipients show that teachers' ideas can lead to changes, ranging from the use of the recipient's idea by other teachers to the development and testing by other teachers on their own new ideas. In addition, the recipient through his innovative project can alter the attitudes of parents and influence the policies of school boards. Finally, the recipient through his project can modify the behavior of numbers of students in meaningful ways, and this total experience can lead to a deepening of the teacher's own professional insight and identity.

If the functional changes possible as the result of minigrants are to be maximized, however, more effective means of informing others about the innovative ideas of the recipients are needed. While the Teacher Innovation Program is adequate for stimulating the development and implementation of innovative ideas in classrooms, it makes little or no provision for the diffusion of these ideas. The need for more thoughtful consideration of the problem of communicating innovative ideas to others is emphasized by the findings in the study indicating that teachers learned about minigrant projects chiefly through informal word-of-mouth means.

Wider intelligence of teacher innovation might be attained, for example, by starting a "Journal of New Jersey Teacher Innovation" devoted to teachers' projects and imaginative ideas, and distributed to every teacher in the State. Another means for improving the transmission of information concerning teachers' innovative ideas might be to create a position at the State level entitled Innovation Consultant. Each year a number of minigrant recipients could be appointed to this position. One task of these consultants might be to visit school districts throughout the State to describe innovative projects which have particular merit. A second task might involve conducting workshops on "innovation in the classroom." A somewhat different approach might be the production of a film about classroom innovation which would include examples from various projects. This film could be planned and produced by a group of minigrant recipients.

A second type of change resulting from focusing on classroom teachers as sources of innovative ideas involves the very contexts or patterns by which schools are organized for goal achievement. The structural patterns of school organization are invariably hierarchical, with teachers typically at the bottom of the hierarchy. While minigrants brought momentary attention to some teachers and their work, there was no evidence from the study that basic changes occurred in the status of teachers as a result of the Teacher Innovation Program.

However, modifications in the operational patterns of schools are probably long term and gradual rather than immediate and precipitate. Hence, it might require sustained activity on the part of a change strategy such as the Teacher Innovation Program before transformations in the formal status of teachers become salient. Consequently, if the Teacher Innovation Program is continued, it should receive periodic monitoring to determine the direction and amount of impact which this kind of external stimulation of classroom teachers has on the contexts in which teacher-recipients function.

In the course of the study it became apparent that the Teacher Innovation Program recognized innovative projects which involved spending money for tangibles such as materials and equipment, or activities, e.g., field trips. This special emphasis causes inquiries to be raised about innovative ideas which need few or no funds to implement, and which, if they exist, would probably receive little acknowledgment from the present Teacher Innovation Program. To what extent does "non-material" innovation occur in public school classrooms? What are the dimensions of this type of innovation? What kinds of teachers develop and try ideas which require little or no financial input? In what ways might such teachers differ, if at all, from teachers whose innovations involve more material emphases? These are some questions to which those associated with the Teacher Innovation Program in New Jersey may wish to address themselves.

A more important issue, perhaps, than "non-material" varieties of classroom innovation concerns the nature of the persistently creative innovative teacher, a topic on which the present study yields no information. The study found that the recipients of minigrants generally perceived themselves to innovate frequently in their teaching. It is doubtful if all of the recipients are equally innovative in the classroom. Moreover, inspection of the projects reveals a wide range of quality in innovative ideas. It would be useful to identify the continuously creative innovative teacher for purposes of discovering the behavioral variables which underlie the idea productions of such professionals. Information on these variables, for example, could aid in the development of programs for improving teachers' innovative behavior. Any investigation designed to locate and describe the creative innovative teaching personality would probably involve an in-depth study using small groups of subjects. Such a study might serve to provide additional scope and direction to the New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program as a strategy for educational change.

APPENDIX 1

Materials Used in the Collection of Data

Green Hall
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey
December 12, 1969

The New Jersey State Department of Education is interested in finding out some effects of the Teacher Innovation (Minigrant) Program during its first year (1968-69). It is vital that any program as ambitious as the one awarding minigrants to New Jersey teachers be monitored periodically. It is particularly important that benchmarks be established at the beginning, so that any examination of the program in subsequent years might have greater meaning. A grant from the U.S. Office of Education makes it possible to study the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program. Your help is needed to assure the success of this study.

The study includes two questionnaires: one to be completed by each 1968-69 minigrant recipient (for projects having two or more recipients, only one, selected at random, will receive a questionnaire); the other to be completed by a member of the administrative staff in the recipient's school. As a follow-up to the questionnaires, a sample of 20 to 30 projects will be visited to obtain interviews with the minigrant recipient and others affected by the project.

The minigrant recipient's questionnaire seeks answers to the following general questions:

1. What are some characteristics of the 1968-69 minigrant recipients, their projects, and the environments in which they teach?
2. What are some of the effects of the projects on the recipients, on other professionals, on pupils, and on lay people?
3. How has information about the results of projects been disseminated?

By completing the enclosed questionnaire you will make a valuable contribution to the study of the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program. It is hoped that you will answer each question as accurately as possible (questions appear on both sides of each sheet). The study is not designed to substantiate a preconceived position or to make the Innovation Program "look good"; all it seeks are the honest answers to the questions mentioned above. If a given question does not permit you to reveal all of the information you have about the topic, feel free to use the margins or additional sheets for your comments.

Your responses to the questionnaire will be treated in strict confidence; they will be shown to no one. Moreover, no questionnaire information will be identified with a given individual or school system in the report of the study. While this research is being conducted for the State Department of Education, I have no official connection with the Department. (I am an Associate Professor of Elementary Education at Trenton State College.) My role is solely that of an impartial observer carrying out a research investigation.

The completed questionnaire should be returned to me by December 31, 1969. A stamped envelope is enclosed for this purpose.

Thank you for your professional contribution to the study of the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program. When the report of the investigation is completed, you will receive a copy.

Sincerely yours,

John K. Walthew

JKW:dhm

John K. Walthew, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

Enclosures

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
225 WEST STATE STREET
P. O. BOX 2019
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

Dear

Last December, you were asked by Dr. John K. Walthew of Trenton State College to participate in a study of the effects of the 1968-69 New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program. As a 1968-69 minigrant recipient, you were sent a copy of a questionnaire, with the request that it be completed and returned to Dr. Walthew by December 31, 1969. To date, no questionnaire has been received from you.

It is important that data be collected from each 1968-69 minigrant recipient. In fact, the State Department of Education feels it is one of your responsibilities as a recipient to cooperate in the study which Dr. Walthew is conducting for the Department. Your responses to the questionnaire will be regarded in strict confidence; they will not be revealed to State Department officials or anyone else. Neither you nor your school will be identified with specific information in the final report of the study.

Kindly return your completed questionnaire to Dr. John K. Walthew at Trenton State College. (If you no longer have the return envelope, Dr. Walthew's complete mailing address is provided in the next paragraph.) You should respond to every item in the questionnaire, even those which ask you how others (administrators, school board members, etc.) perceive events. If you do not know precisely how administrators or school board members, for example, feel about an event, answer the question in terms of how you think they feel.

If you no longer have your questionnaire, you should secure one at once by writing to the following address:

Dr. John K. Walthew
Associate Professor of Elementary Education
Green Hall
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Dr. Walthew can be reached by telephone by calling the following number: Area Code 609-882-1855, Ext. 315.

Thank you for your professional contribution to the study of the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Adams

Thomas Adams
Teacher Innovation Program

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
225 WEST STATE STREET
P.O. BOX 2019
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

Green Hall
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey
April 6, 1970

As you know, a professional staff member in your school (or district) received a Minigrant from the New Jersey State Department of Education for 1968-69. The State Department is interested in finding out some effects of the Teacher Innovation (Minigrant) Program during its first year (1968-69). It is vital that any program as ambitious as the one awarding minigrants to New Jersey teachers be monitored periodically. It is particularly important that benchmarks be established at the beginning, so that any examination of the program in subsequent years might have greater meaning. A grant from the U.S. Office of Education makes it possible to study the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program. Your help is needed to assure the success of this study.

The study includes two questionnaires: one completed by each 1968-69 minigrant recipient (for projects having two or more recipients, only one, selected at random, received a questionnaire); the other to be completed by a member of the administrative staff in the recipient's school. As a follow-up to the questionnaires, a sample of 20 to 30 projects will be visited to obtain interviews with the minigrant recipient and others affected by the project. Completed questionnaires have already been received from most minigrant recipients.

The administrator's questionnaire seeks answers to the following general questions:

1. What are some of the characteristics of administrators closely associated with the 1968-69 minigrant recipients and the environments in which these administrators and recipients work?

2. What knowledge do administrators have about the following:
    a. the nature and development of recipients' projects,
    b. the effects of projects on recipients, other professionals, pupils, and lay people?

3. How has information about the results of projects been disseminated?

If you are the administrative official most knowledgeable about the work of the minigrant recipient in your school or district, kindly complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me. By completing the administrator's questionnaire you will make a valuable contribution to the study of the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program. It is hoped that you will answer each question as accurately as possible (questions appear on both sides of each sheet). Please respond to all questions, even though you may not feel at the moment that you have enough knowledge to make a response. Also, please respond to the questionnaire with the knowledge you have at the moment. Since the recipient's and the administrator's questionnaires are independent of each other, it is important that the administrator and the recipient not consult each other.

If you are not the administrative official most knowledgeable about the work of the minigrant recipient, I would appreciate your referring this material to the appropriate person at once.

The study is not designed to substantiate a preconceived position or to make the Innovation Program "look good"; all it seeks are the honest answers to the questions mentioned above. If a given question does not permit you to reveal all of the information you have about the topic, feel free to use the margins or additional sheets for your comments.

Your responses to the questionnaire will be treated in strict confidence; they will be shown to no one. Moreover, no questionnaire information will be identified with a given individual or school system in the report of the study. While this research is being conducted for the State Department of Education, I have no official connection with the Department. (I am an Associate Professor of Elementary Education at Trenton State College.) My role is solely that of an impartial observer carrying out a research investigation.

A number of minigrant projects involved multiple recipients. In these cases, one recipient was selected at random and sent a questionnaire. In responding to most items of the administrator's questionnaire it will not make any difference whether there was only one or many recipients. For those items for which it is necessary to know the name of the person in your school who received a recipient's questionnaire, this name is found on a card attached to the last page of this letter.

In a few instances there was more than one minigrant project in a particular school. It is not the intention of this study to ask an administrator to complete more than one questionnaire. Hence, if there was more than one 1968-69 minigrant project in your school, the name of the recipient who is to be the subject of your questionnaire is found on a card attached to the last page of this letter.

The completed questionnaire should be returned to me by April 20, 1970. A stamped envelope is enclosed for this purpose. If you have any questions about the study, write or call me at Trenton State College: Area Code 609-882-1855.

Thank you for your professional contribution to the study of the 1968-69 Teacher Innovation Program. When the report of the investigation is completed, you will receive a copy.

Sincerely yours,

John K. Walthew

John K. Walthew, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator,
Teacher Innovation Program Study
and
Associate Professor of Elementary
Education, Trenton State College

JKW:dhm

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

1968-69 MINIGRANT RECIPIENTS

NEW JERSEY TEACHER INNOVATION PROJECT

This questionnaire has been prepared to obtain information from teachers who received minigrants during the 1968-69 school year. It is important to respond to each question as accurately as possible. If you have additional information about a question, use the space between lines or in the margins. You may also attach extra sheets, if you wish.

1. Sex
    a. Male ☐
    b. Female ☐

2. Age (at the time you received your minigrant).
    a. 20-24 ☐
    b. 25-29 ☐
    c. 30-34 ☐
    d. 35-39 ☐
    e. 40-44 ☐
    f. 45-49 ☐
    g. 50 and older ☐

3. Number of years teaching in your present school system (including the 1968-69 school year, but not 1969-70).
    a. 1 year ☐
    b. 2-3 years ☐
    c. 4-5 years ☐
    d. 6-10 years ☐
    e. 11-15 years ☐
    f. 16-20 years ☐
    g. More than 20 years ☐

4. Total number of years teaching (including the 1968-69 school year, but not 1969-70).
    a. 1 year ☐
    b. 2-3 years ☐
    c. 4-5 years ☐
    d. 6-10 years ☐
    e. 11-15 years ☐
    f. 16-20 years ☐
    g. More than 20 years ☐

5. Amount of formal education. (Check one.)
    a. Attended college but do not hold an undergraduate (baccalaureate) degree ☐
    b. Hold an undergraduate college degree ☐
    c. Hold an undergraduate college degree and have taken additional course work, but not in an advanced degree program ☐
    d. Hold an undergraduate college degree and have taken additional course work in an advanced degree program ☐
    e. Hold a master's degree ☐

f. Hold a master's degree and have taken additional course work, but not toward a doctor's degree ☐

g. Hold a master's degree and working toward a doctor's degree ☐

h. Hold a doctor's degree ☐

6. Indicate the name and location of the college from which you received your undergraduate (baccalaureate) degree.

____

7. Teaching grade area in 1968-69. (If you taught in more than one area, check the one area under a or b where you spent most of your time.)

a. Regular classroom teacher
   1. Elementary school
      (a) Grades K-3 ☐
      (b) Grades 4-6 ☐
   2. Intermediate school ☐
   3. Junior school ☐
   4. High school ☐

b. Teacher of special subjects
   1. Elementary school ☐
   2. Intermediate school ☐
   3. Junior school ☐
   4. High school ☐

c. Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

8. Teaching field in 1968-69. (If you were an elementary, intermediate, or junior school teacher who had the same group of pupils for several subjects each day, check one of the first three boxes. If you taught a single subject only, even in the elementary school, indicate your subject. If you taught more than one subject, but did not have the same group of pupils all day, check the one in which you did most of your teaching.)

a. Elementary school teacher ☐

b. Intermediate school teacher ☐

c. Junior school teacher ☐

d. Teacher of
   1. Agriculture ☐
   2. Art ☐

3. Behavioral sciences (sociology, psychology, etc.) ☐
4. Biological sciences ☐
5. Business Education (Accounting, general business, secretarial studies, typing) ☐
6. Distributive occupations ☐
7. Driver education ☐
8. English language and literature ☐
9. Foreign language(s) ☐
10. Home economics ☐
11. Industrial Arts ☐
12. Mathematics ☐
13. Music ☐
14. Physical education (including health and coaching) ☐
15. Physical sciences (physics, chemistry, general science, earth science, etc.) ☐
16. Reading ☐
17. Recreation ☐
18. Skilled trades ☐
19. Social studies (geography, history, economics, political science, etc.) ☐
20. Special education (mentally retarded, disabled) ☐
21. Speech and drama ☐
22. Technical occupations ☐
23. Vocational-Technical related subjects ☐
24. Other (Please indicate) ☐

____

e. Specialists and special service personnel

1. Aduio-visual ☐
2. Guidance Counselor ☐
3. Librarian ☐
4. Nurse ☐

5. Psychologist ☐

6. Other (Please indicate) ☐

____

f. Administrative personnel

1. Assistant principal ☐

2. Coordinator (Please indicate field)______________________ ☐

3. Department head (Please indicate field)______________________ ☐

4. Principal ☐

5. Supervisor (Please indicate field)______________________ ☐

6. Other (Please indicate) ☐

____

9. Do you hold a standard (regular) or permanent New Jersey teaching certificate in the field checked in Item 8?

a. Yes ☐

b. No ☐

c. You are not classified as a teacher (Please indicate whether you hold a certificate for your position) ☐

10. To which of the following local groups did you belong when you applied for a minigrant? (Check one.)

a. Local teachers' association ☐

b. Teachers' union local ☐

c. Both the local teachers' association and the union ☐

d. Neither the local teachers' association nor the union ☐

If you checked local teachers' association, answer 10A; if you checked teachers' union, answer 10B; if you have checked both, answer 10A and 10B.

10A. What part have you played in your local teachers' association?

a. Leadership role ☐

b. Member only ☐

10B. What part have you played in your teachers' union local?

a. Leadership role ☐

b. Member only ☐

11. With which of the following were you affiliated at the time you applied for a minigrant? (Check all that apply to you.)

a. District, regional, or national teachers' union council ☐

b. County teachers' association ☐

c. New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) ☐

d. National Education Association (NEA) ☐

e. None of the above ☐

12. List any leadership responsibility you have had for each category checked in Item 11. Leadership responsibility includes serving as a member of a committee of a given organization. List only responsibilities existing at or prior to your application for a minigrant.

13. List any professional organizations other than teachers' unions or teachers' associations (including NJEA and NEA) to which you belonged at the time you applied for a minigrant, e.g., county chapter of the International Reading Association (IRA). For each organization listed, indicate whether you have been a member only or have held a leadership position.

Organization	Member Only	Leadership Position
	☐	☐
	☐	☐
	☐	☐
	☐	☐
	☐	☐

14. For each organization listed in Item 13, indicate the extent to which you attended meetings during the school year preceding your minigrant application, e.g., the county chapter of the International Reading Association might have met four times in 1967-68; two of the meetings might have been attended.

Organization	Number of Meetings Held	Number of Meetings Attended
	☐	☐
	☐	☐
	☐	☐
	☐	☐
	☐	☐

15. How many professional books did you read during 1967-68, the year preceding your minigrant application. (Exclude books read in conjunction with college courses.)

a. None ☐
b. 1-2 ☐
c. 3-5 ☐
d. 6-10 ☐
e. More than 10 ☐

15A. List the titles of the books which you read.

____

____

____

____

16. List the titles of any professional journals or magazines which you read fairly frequently during 1967-68, the year preceding your minigrant application. (Exclude journals and magazines read in conjunction with college courses.)

____

____

____

____

17. Which of the following best describes what you expect to be doing five years from now? (Check one.)

a. Teaching the same grade or subject ☐

b. Teaching a different grade or subject (Indicate the grade or subject, etc.) ______________ ☐

c. Working in the public school in a specialized staff position, e.g., reading consultant, guidance counselor, school psychologist, etc. (Indicate the position.) ☐

____

d. Working in the public school in an administrative or supervisory capacity, e.g, principal, supervisor, department head, curriculum director, etc. (Indicate the position.)______________________ ☐

e. Not in the public schools, but still in education or in educationally related work (Indicate the type of work.)______________________________ ☐

f. Not in teaching or educationally related work ☐

18. Which of the following most accurately describes the teaching climate existing in your school when you applied for a minigrant? (Check one.)

a. Teachers are encouraged by administrators to try out new ideas in their classrooms however, administrators want to be informed of the new ideas ☐

b. Teachers are encouraged by administrators to try out new ideas in their classrooms - it is not necessary to inform administrators ☐

c. Teachers are free (but not encouraged by administrators) to try out new ideas in their classrooms - however, administrators want to be informed of the new ideas ☐

d. Teachers are free (but not encouraged by administrators) to try out new ideas in their classrooms - it is not necessary to inform administrators ☐

e. Teachers may try out new ideas in their classrooms only if the ideas are originated by administrators ☐

f. Teachers are discouraged by administrators from trying out new ideas in their classrooms ☐

19. Which of the following most accurately describes your project? (Check one.)

a. Adoption - you took an idea, technique, material, etc. developed by someone else and made it your project ☐

b. Adaption - you took an idea, technique, material, etc., developed by someone else, modified it to conform to the requirements of your teaching situation, and made it your project ☐

c. Creativity - you developed your project around your own idea, technique, material, etc. ☐

20. Where did you obtain the idea for the topic of your minigrant project? If more than one applies, check the one source which influenced you most.

a. Solely from your own thinking ☐

b. From a non-public school professional source

(1) Reading professional literature ☐

(2) Taking college courses ☐

(3) Attending a meeting of a professional organization ☐

(4) Other (Please indicate.)____________ ☐

____

c. From a professional in public school work

(1) A teacher in the same field or at the same grade level in your building ☐

(2) A teacher in a different field or at a different grade level in your building ☐

(3) A teacher in another building in your school district ☐

(4) A teacher in another school district ☐

(5) An administrator or supervisor (including department head) in your building ☐

(6) An administrator in another building in your school district ☐

(7) An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

d. From a non-professional source

(1) Reading ☐

(2) Talking with a school board member ☐

(3) Talking with parents ☐

(4) Talking with students ☐

(5) Other (Please indicate)________________ ☐

____

21. Some interests which may have influenced the development of your project are listed below. Use the numbers one to four to indicate the order in which these interests influenced you. Place the number one in the box of the interest which influenced you most, the number two in the box of the interest which was next most influential, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Interest in subject matter content (concepts, skills, etc.) to be taught ☐

b. Interest in changes in pupils as a result of your project's implementation or use ☐

c. Interest in the materials and/or the technological equipment used in the project ☐

d. Interest in developing a new method or technique for your teaching repertoire ☐

22. If an interest completely different from the four listed in Item 21 above influenced you most in developing your project, please indicate it.

____

____

23. Who helped you decide to apply for a minigrant for your project? If more than one helped, check the one that was most influential.

a. No one ☐

b. Professionals in public school work

- (1) A teacher in the same field or at the same grade level in your building ☐
- (2) A teacher in a different field or at a different grade level in your building ☐
- (3) A teacher in another building in your school district ☐
- (4) A teacher in another school district ☐
- (5) An administrator or supervisor (including department head) in your building ☐
- (6) An administrator in another building in your school district ☐
- (7) An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

c. Professional educators not involved in public school work

- (1) State Department of Education personnel ☐
- (2) Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐
- (3) College professor ☐
- (4) Other (Please indicate)______________ ☐

____

d. Non-professionals

- (1) School board member ☐
- (2) Parent ☐
- (3) Student ☐
- (4) Other (Please indicate) ______________ ☐

____

24. Below are some reasons why teachers sought minigrants to obtain financial assistance for their projects. Place the number one in the box following the reason that best applies to you, the number two in the box following the reason that is next most applicable to you, etc. Each box should contain a number, from one to five, but any number should not be used more than once.

a. Confidence in your ability to win a minigrant ☐

b. Feeling that your project was so important that it was worthy of the effort of writing a proposal that might or might not be funded ☐

c. Feeling that obtaining a minigrant would provide you with greater professional recognition ☐

d. Feeling that applying for a minigrant was what those with whom you work expected of you ☐

e. Feeling that a minigrant was a means of getting materials and/or equipment which might be obtained in no other way ☐

25. If a reason completely different from those listed above in Item 24 influenced you most in applying for a minigrant, please indicate it.

____

____

____

26. As you prepared your minigrant proposal for submission to the State Department of Education, with whom did you consult? Check each one with whom you consulted. For each one checked, enter one of the four numbers below in the second box to indicate the amount of consultation:

(1) the proposal was largely this person's work

(2) you worked closely with the person in preparing your proposal

(3) you worked occasionally with the person in preparing your proposal

(4) you talked once or twice with the person about preparing your proposal

	Person Consulted	Amount of Consultation
a. No one was consulted ☐		
b. Professionals in public school work		
(1) A teacher in the same field or at the same grade level in your building	☐	☐
(2) A teacher in a different field or at a different grade level in your building	☐	☐
(3) A teacher in another building in your school district	☐	☐
(4) A teacher in another school district	☐	☐
(5) An administrator or supervisor (including department head) in your building	☐	☐
(6) An administrator in another building in your school district	☐	☐
(7) An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent)	☐	☐

c. Professional educators not involved in public school work

(1) State Department of Education personnel ☐ ☐

(2) Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐ ☐

(3) College professor ☐ ☐

(4) Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐ ☐

____

d. Non-professionals

(1) School board member ☐ ☐

(2) Parent ☐ ☐

(3) Student ☐ ☐

(4) Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐ ☐

____

27. As you conducted your project, a number of people may have known what you were doing. In the box following each category of persons, indicate the number who knew about your project in operation. For example, if five teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building knew about your project as you were conducting it, enter the number five in the box following this category. A blank box indicates no one in that category knew about your project in operation.

a. No one knew your project was going on ☐

No. of Persons

b. Professionals in public school work

(1) Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building ☐

(2) Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building ☐

(3) Teachers in another building in your school district ☐

(4) Teachers in another school district ☐

(5) Administrators and/or supervisors (including department heads) in your building ☐

(6) Administrators in another building in your school district ☐

(7) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

c. Professional educators not involved in public school work

(1) State Department of Education personnel ☐

(2) Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐

(3) College professors ☐

(4) Others (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

d. Non-professionals

(1) School board members ☐

(2) Parents ☐

(3) Students ☐

(4) Others (Please indicate)________________ ☐

____

28. You are probably aware of how others felt about your project (the nature of what you were trying to do). For each of the groups comprising this item, indicate the consensus of feelings about your project. This is to be done by placing one of the following five numbers in the box after each category that applies. If you are not aware of how a category of persons feels about your project, enter no number in the box.

(1) expressed strong enthusiasm about your project

(2) felt your project was interesting, but did not become overly excited about it

(3) had no strong feelings one way or another about your project

(4) were skeptical about the value of your project, but did not condemn it

(5) expressed strong negative comments about your project

a. Professionals in public school work

(1) Teachers in the same field or at the same level in your building ☐

(2) Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building ☐

(3) Teachers in another building in your school district ☐

(4) Teachers in another school district ☐

(5) Administrators and supervisors (including department heads) in your building ☐

(6) Administrators in another building in your school district ☐

(7) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

b. Professional educators not involved in public school work

(1) State Department of Education personnel ☐

(2) Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐

(3) College professors ☐

(4) Others (Please indicate)________________ ☐

____

c. Non-professionals

(1) School board members ☐

(2) Parents ☐

(3) Students ☐

(4) Others (Please indicate) ______________ ☐

____

29. You are probably aware of how others felt regarding the value of the minigrant awards as you prepared your proposal and conducted your project. For each of the groups comprising this item, indicate the consensus of the feelings toward the value of minigrant awards. This is to be done by placing one of the following five numbers in the box after each category that applies. If you are not aware of how a category of persons feels about the minigrant awards, enter no number in the boxes.

(1) expressed strong enthusiasm regarding the value of minigrants

(2) felt minigrants had some value, but were not overly excited about them

(3) had no strong feelings one way or the other about minigrants

(4) were skeptical about the value of minigrants, but did not condemn them

(5) expressed strong negative feelings about the value of minigrants

a. Professionals in public school work

(1) Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building ☐

(2) Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building ☐

(3) Teachers in another building in your school district ☐

(4) Teachers in another school district ☐

(5) Administrators and supervisors (including department heads) in your building ☐

(6) Administrators in another building in your school district ☐

(7) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

b. Professional educators not involved in public school work

(1) State Department of Education personnel ☐

(2) Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐

(3) College professors ☐

(4) Others (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

c. Non-professionals

(1) School board members ☐

(2) Parents ☐

(3) Students ☐

(4) Others (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

30. Which of the following two descriptions most accurately characterizes your project?

a. The project directly involved teaching students ☐

b. The project was primarily involved with the production of materials, the use of technology, or the development of methods or techniques which might be used with students at a later time (however, the immediate focus of the project was not the teaching of students). ☐

31. Estimate the number of pupils that have been affected by your project. Enter this number in the box following the response that is appropriate for your project.

a. Direct effect - your project directly involved the teaching of students ☐

b. Indirect effect - your project was concerned with producing materials, etc., and only indirectly has involved the teaching of students ☐

c. You have no knowledge of the number of pupils affected by your project

32. Which of the following best describes the effect of your project on pupils? (Check one.)

a. There were immediate, observable changes in pupils ☐

b. Only long range changes in pupils can be expected ☐

c. There were immediate, observable changes in pupils as well as the possibility of long range changes ☐

d. There were no immediate, observable changes in pupils, and long range changes are unlikely ☐

33. Which of the following best describes the nature of the change in pupils' behavior resulting from your project? (Check one.)

a. Pupils know or understand some subject matter, e.g., facts, concepts, generalizations, etc. ☐

b. Pupils are able to perform some skill, e.g., reading for literal comprehension, batting a ball, etc. ☐

c. Pupils understand some aspect of themselves (or of the behavior of others) ☐

d. Pupils are able to relate more effectively to others ☐

e. Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

f. It is not possible to describe the changes in pupils' behavior resulting from the project ☐

g. The project was not designed to produce changes in pupils' behavior ☐

34. Did your project have any effect on the rate at which pupils learn? (Check one.)

a. Yes - as a result of the project there was a perceptible change in the rate that pupils learned ☐

b. No - as a result of the project little or no discernible change in the rate that pupils could do something was detected ☐

c. The project was not designed to produce a change in the rate pupils could do something ☐

d. It was not possible to tell whether there was any change in the rate that pupils could do something as a result of the project ☐

35. In the box following each category, estimate the number of teachers who have made use of something from your project, e.g., subject matter, methods, materials, results, etc. If no teachers have used anything, enter a zero in the box. A blank box will indicate that you do not know whether any teachers in a category have made use of your project. In the second box following each category, evaluate this use by entering the number of one of the following statements:

(1) Most of the teachers indicated have incorporated important aspects of your project into their own teaching

(2) Most of the teachers indicated have shown an interest in important aspects of your project, but have so far not used these in their own teaching

(3) Most of the teachers indicated have incorporated unimportant aspects of your project into their own teaching

(4) Most of the teachers indicated have shown an interest in unimportant aspects of the project, but have so far not used them in their own teaching

	No. of Teachers	Evaluation of Use
a. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building	☐	☐
b. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building	☐	☐
c. Teachers in another building in your school district	☐	☐
d. Teachers in another school district	☐	☐

36. List the names of teachers in your building who are using something from your project in their teaching.

____

____

____

37. Which of the following most accurately describes the innovation attempts of teachers in your building? (Check one.)

a. Adoption - teachers use new ideas, techniques, materials etc., developed by others ☐

b. Adaption - teachers modify ideas, techniques, materials, etc., developed by others to fit their teaching situations ☐

c. Creativity - teachers develop their own ideas, techniques, materials, etc. ☐

d. Teachers do not usually use innovations in their work ☐

38. How have other teachers generally learned about your project? (Check all responses which represent important means of communicating information about your project.)

a. Oral means

(1) Teachers have contacted you regarding your project (these teachers have originated requests for information) ☐

(2) You have volunteered information about your project through informal contacts with teachers ☐

(3) You have described your project to other teachers at formal school faculty meetings ☐

(4) You have informed other teachers about your project at meetings of professional organizations, e.g., NJEA, International Reading Association (IRA), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), etc. ☐

(5) Administrative and/or supervisory personnel (including department heads) in your building have informed other teachers about your project ☐

(6) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent) have informed other teachers about your project ☐

(7) Another teacher has informed teachers about your project ☐

(8) Other oral means (Please indicate)________________ ☐

____

b. Written means

(1) A report of your project written by you has been made available to teachers ☐

(2) A report of your project prepared by an administrator or supervisor (including department head) in your building has been made available to teachers ☐

(3) A report of your project prepared by an administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) has been made available to teachers ☐

(4) A report of your project has appeared in the local papers (Indicate the person responsible for this, e.g., you, your building principal, your superintendent, etc.)________________________ ☐

(5) A report of your project has appeared in a professional publication, e.g., NJEA Review (indicate the person writing the report, e.g., you, your building principal, your superintendent, a fellow teacher, etc.________________________ ☐

(6) Other written means (Please indicate)____________ ☐

____

c. There has been no oral or written dissemination of information about your project to teachers ☐

39. What has been the effect of your project on the board of education in your school district? (Check one.)

a. The board is so impressed with the results of your project it has decided to continue financial support for it and/or similar projects ☐

b. The board has expressed keen interest in the results of your project, but not to the point of making any financial commitments to it and/or similar projects ☐

c. The board has shown mild interest in the results of your project ☐

d. While the board knows about your project, it has not expressed interest one way or the other in the results ☐

e. The board has indicated a basic disinterest in the results of your project ☐

f. The board has expressed strong negative feelings concerning the results of your project ☐

g. The board appears to know little or nothing about the results of your project ☐

h. You have no knowledge of what the board knows about your project ☐

40. What has been the effect of your project on parents in your school district? (Check one.)

a. Parents are so deeply impressed with the results of your project they wish to see it continued or expanded ☐

b. Parents have expressed keen interest in your project, but generally have not indicated a desire to see it continued or expanded ☐

c. Parents have shown mild interest in your project ☐

d. While parents are aware of your project, they have not expressed interest one way or the other in the results ☐

e. Parents have signified a basic disinterest in the results of your project ☐

f. Parents have expressed strong negative feelings about the results of your project ☐

g. Parents appear to know little or nothing about the results of your project ☐

h. You have no knowledge of what parents know about your project ☐

41. How have the board of education and parents learned about the results of your project? (Check all responses which have served as important means of communicating your project to the board and/or parents. The first column of boxes concerns the school board, and the second column concerns parents.)

	School Board Members	Parents
a. Oral means		
(1) Parents and board members contacted you to learn of the results of your project	☐	☐
(2) You conveyed information about the results of your project through informal contacts	☐	☐
(3) You made formal presentations in which you described the results of your project	☐	☐
(4) An administrator or supervisor (including department head) in your building conveyed information about your project	☐	☐
(5) An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) provided information about your project	☐	☐
(6) Another teacher has reported the results of your project	☐	☐
(7) Other oral means (Please indicate)____________ ______________________________	☐	☐
b. Written means		
(1) Your writing		
(a) An unpublished report	☐	☐
(b) A published article	☐	☐
(2) The writing of an administrator or supervisor (including department head) in your building		
(a) An unpublished report	☐	☐
(b) A published article	☐	☐
(3) The writing of an administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent)		
(a) An unpublished report	☐	☐
(b) A published article	☐	☐
(4) The writing of another teacher		
(a) An unpublished report	☐	☐
(b) A published article	☐	☐
(5) An article written by a professional educator not connected with a public school system	☐	☐
(6) A magazine or newspaper article written by a layman	☐	☐
(7) Other written means (Please indicate)________ ______________________________	☐	☐

c. There has been no oral or written dissemination of information about your project ☐

42. Indicate the extent to which there has been an increase in teachers' trying out new ideas in their classes following the implementation of your project. The following categories of teachers are to be considered:

(1) Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building

(2) Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building

(3) Teachers in other buildings in your school district

(4) Teachers in other school districts

Every response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of teachers listed above. The number at the top of each of the four columns of boxes corresponds to one of these categories of teachers. Check the box for each category of teachers to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Category of Teachers			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. There has been a marked increase in teachers' trying out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Teachers have shown a marked increase in interest in trying out new ideas without actually doing so	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. There has been a mild increase in teachers' trying out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Teachers have shown a mild increase in interest in trying out new ideas without actually doing so	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. There has been no change in teacher interest in trying out new ideas or in their attempts to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There has been a decline in teacher interest in trying out new ideas or in their attempts to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. You have no knowledge of teacher interest in trying out new ideas or their attempts to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐

43. Indicate the degree to which teachers tried out new ideas in their work prior to the initiation of your project. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently

(2) Sometimes

(3) Seldom or never

Each category of teachers is followed by three boxes. For each category, check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	Frequently	**Sometimes**	**Seldom or Never**
a. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building	☐	☐	☐
b. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building	☐	☐	☐
c. Teachers in other buildings in your school district	☐	☐	☐
d. Teachers in other school districts	☐	☐	☐

44. Indicate the extent to which your project has influenced administrator thinking regarding teachers' trying out new ideas in the classroom. The following categories of administrators are to be considered:

(1) Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in your building

(2) Administrators in other buildings in your school district

(3) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)

(4) Administrators in other school districts

Every response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of administrators listed above. The number at the top of each of the four columns of boxes corresponds to one of these categories of administrators. Check the box for each category of administrators to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Categories of Administrators			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. There has been a marked increase in administrators attempts to get teachers to try out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators have shown a marked increase in interest in having teachers try out new ideas without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. There has been a mild increase in administrators' attempts to get teachers to try out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators have shown a mild increase in interest in having teachers try out new ideas without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐

e. There has been no change in administrator interest in trying out new ideas in teaching or in their attempts to get teachers to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There has been a decline in administrator interest in teachers' trying out new ideas in teaching or in their attempts to get teachers to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. You have no knowledge of administrator interest in teachers' trying out new ideas in teaching or in their attempts to get teachers to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐

45. Indicate the degree to which administrators encouraged teachers to try out new ideas in their work prior to the initiation of your project. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently

(2) Sometimes

(3) Seldom or never

Each category of administrators is followed by three boxes. For each category, check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom or Never
a. Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in your building	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators in other buildings in your school district	☐	☐	☐
c. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators in other school districts	☐	☐	☐

46. Indicate the extent your obtaining a minigrant has increased teacher interest in applying for minigrants. The following categories of teachers are to be considered:

(1) Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building

(2) Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building

(3) Teachers in other buildings in your school district

(4) Teachers in other school districts

Every response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of teachers listed above. The number at the top of each of the columns of boxes corresponds to one of the categories of teachers. Check the box for each category of teachers to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Category of Teachers (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. Your obtaining a minigrant has been followed by other teachers writing proposals which they plan to submit to the State Department of Education	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. After you received a minigrant, teachers expressed strong interest in writing proposals, but so far have not done so	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. After you received a minigrant, teachers expressed mild interest in writing proposals	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. After you received a minigrant, there was little or no increase in teacher interest in writing proposals	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. After you received a minigrant, there was a decrease in teacher interest in writing proposals	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. You have no knowledge of teacher interest in applying for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐

47. Indicate the extent of teacher interest in applying for minigrants prior to funding of your proposal. Use the following ratings:

(1) High
(2) Medium
(3) Low

Each category of teachers is followed by three boxes. For each category, check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	High	Medium	Low
a. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in your building	☐	☐	☐
b. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in your building	☐	☐	☐
c. Teachers in other buildings in your school district	☐	☐	☐
d. Teachers in other school districts	☐	☐	☐

48. Indicate the extent your obtaining a minigrant has influenced administrator interest in encouraging teachers to write proposals. The following categories of administrators are to be considered:

(1) Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in your building

(2) Administrators in other buildings in your school district

(3) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)

(4) Administrators in other school districts

Every response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of administrators listed above. The number at the top of each of the four columns of boxes corresponds to one of these categories of administrators. Check the box for each category of administrators to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Categories of Administrators (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. There has been a marked increase in administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators have shown a marked increase in interest in having teachers apply for minigrants without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. There has been a mild increase in administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators have shown a mild increase in interest in having teachers apply for minigrants without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. There has been no change in administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There has been a decline in administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. You have no knowledge of administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐

49. Indicate the extent to which administrators encouraged teachers to apply for minigrants prior to the funding of your proposal. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently

(2) Sometimes

(3) Seldom or never

Each category of administrators is followed by three boxes. For each category, check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom or Never
a. Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in your building	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators in other buildings in your school district	☐	☐	☐
c. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators in other school districts	☐	☐	☐

50. Indicate the extent you have changed with respect to each of the behaviors listed below since you received a minigrant. The following ratings are to be used:

(1) Increased greatly
(2) Some increase
(3) No change
(4) Some decline
(5) Declined greatly

	Increased Greatly	Some Increase	No Change	Some Decline	Declined Greatly
a. Contacts with teachers					
(1) Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(2) Formal, i.e., speaking to groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Contacts with administrators					
(1) Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(2) Formal, e.g., speaking to groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Contacts with school board members					
(1) Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(2) Formal, e.g., speaking at board meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Contacts with parents					
(1) Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(2) Formal, e.g., speaking to groups such as the PTA	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Reading professional literature	☐	☐		☐	☐

f. Membership in professional organizations	☐	☐	☐
g. Leadership in professional organizations	☐	☐	☐
h. Attending professional meetings	☐	☐	☐
i. Trying out new ideas in your own teaching	☐	☐	☐

51. The following represent some ways that teaching might be varied. Indicate the extent which you used each prior to your application for a minigrant. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently - 10 or more times per year
(2) Sometimes - 3 to 9 times per year
(3) Almost never - 2 or fewer times per year

	Frequently	Sometimes	Almost Never
a. Introducing new and/or unique content (concepts, skills, etc.) into your teaching program	☐	☐	☐
b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching	☐	☐	☐
c. Using different materials and/or technology in your teaching	☐	☐	☐

52. Give some examples of ways you have varied your teaching to support your responses to Item 51 above.

____

____

____

____

____

53. Some activities performed by teachers are listed below. Use the numbers one to seven to indicate the order of interest of these activities to you. Place the number one in the box of the activity that you like to do most, the number two in the box of the activity that is of next greatest interest to you, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Helping a shy pupil relate more effectively to other youngsters	☐
b. Presenting a concept to a group of students	☐
c. Preparing learning materials for pupils	☐

d. Deciding what should be taught to a group of pupils ☐

e. Determining what weaknesses given pupils have in a subject field ☐

f. Working with an individual pupil to correct a particular deficiency ☐

g. Determining the effects of a particular teaching strategy on pupils ☐

54. Below are some ways to teach. Use the numbers one to seven to indicate the order in which you use them in your own work. Place the number one in the box of the way that you use most frequently, the number two in the box of the way that you use next most frequently, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers with whom you have talked or whom you have seen ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using your own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching using the ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways that pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

55. Rank the ways of teaching in the order that other teachers use them in their work. Enter the number one in the box of the way you feel other teachers use first and foremost, the number two in the box of the way other teachers use next, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using one's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching using the ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways that pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

56. Rank the ways of teaching in the order of their importance to administrators and supervisors. Enter the number one in the box of the way which administrators feel is the most important, the number two in the box of the way administrators feel is next most important, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using one's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching using the ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways that pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

57. Rank the ways of teaching in the order of their importance to school board members.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using one's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching using the ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways that pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

58. Rank the ways of teaching in the order of their importance to parents.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using one's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching using the ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways that pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

59. Below are listed some ways which a teacher might use to vary his teaching. Use the numbers one to three to indicate the order of importance of these ways to other teachers. Enter the number one in the box of the way other teachers use most often, the number two in the box of the way other teachers use next most often, and the number three in the box of the way other teachers use least often. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Introducing new content (concepts, skills, etc.) into teaching ☐

b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching ☐

c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching ☐

60. Rank the ways of varying teaching in the order of their importance to administrators and supervisors. Enter the number one in the box of the way which administrators feel is most important, etc.

a. Introducing new content (concepts, skills, etc.) into teaching ☐

b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching ☐

c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching ☐

61. Rank the ways of varying teaching in the order of their importance to school board members.

a. Introducing new content (concepts, skills, etc.) into teaching ☐

b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching ☐

c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching ☐

62. Rank the ways of varying teaching in the order of their importance to parents.

a. Introducing new content (concepts, skills, etc.) into teaching ☐

b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching ☐

c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching ☐

63. What has obtaining a minigrant meant to you? Use the space below for your response. Attach additional sheets, if necessary.

Name ______________________________

School District ______________________

Date ______________________________

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

ADMINISTRATORS

1968-69 NEW JERSEY TEACHER INNOVATION PROJECT

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire has been prepared to obtain information from administrators working closely with teachers who received minigrants from the State Department of Education for the 1968-69 school year. It is important to answer each question as accurately as you can. If you have additional information about a question, use the space between lines or in the margins. Extra sheets may be attached, if needed.

1. Your sex.
    - a. Male ☐
    - b. Female ☐
2. Your age.
    - a. 20-24 ☐
    - b. 25-29 ☐
    - c. 30-34 ☐
    - d. 34-39 ☐
    - e. 40-44 ☐
    - f. 45-49 ☐
    - g. 50 or older ☐
3. Number of years in your present administrative position (including the 1968-69 school year, but not 1969-70).
    - a. 1 year ☐
    - b. 2-3 years ☐
    - c. 4-5 years ☐
    - d. 6-10 years ☐
    - e. 11-15 years ☐
    - f. 16-20 years ☐
    - g. More than 20 years ☐
4. Total number of years administrative experience (including the 1968-69 school year, but not 1969-70).
    - a. 1 year ☐
    - b. 2-3 years ☐
    - c. 4-5 years ☐
    - d. 6-10 years ☐
    - e. 11-15 years ☐
    - f. 16-20 years ☐
    - g. More than 20 years ☐
5. Total number of years full-time teaching experience prior to becoming an administrator.
    - a. 1 year ☐
    - b. 2-3 years ☐
    - c. 4-5 years ☐
    - d. 6-10 years ☐
    - e. 11-15 years ☐
    - f. 16-20 years ☐
    - g. More than 20 years ☐
6. Amount of formal education. (Check one.)
    - a. Attended college but do not have an undergraduate (baccalaureate) degree ☐
    - b. Hold an undergraduate college degree ☐
    - c. Hold an undergraduate college degree and have taken additional course work, but not in an advanced degree program ☐
    - d. Hold an undergraduate college degree and have taken additional course work toward an advanced degree ☐

e. Hold a master's degree ☐

f. Hold a master's degree and have taken additional course work, but not toward a doctor's degree ☐

g. Hold a master's degree and working toward a doctor's degree ☐

h. Hold a doctor's degree ☐

7. Indicate the type of school in which you do most of your work. (Check one.)

a. Elementary school (grades K-6) ☐

b. Other elementary school - less than grades K-6 (Please indicate the grades in the school) ______ ☐

c. Intermediate school ☐

d. Junior High school ☐

e. High school ☐

f. Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

8. Indicate the number of teachers in your school building. (Count all teachers who serve in your building.)

a. 9 or less ☐

b. 10-19 ☐

c. 20-29 ☐

d. 30-39 ☐

e. 40-49 ☐

f. 50-59 ☐

g. 60 or more ☐

9. What type of community does your school building serve? (Check one.)

a. Urban ☐

b. Suburban ☐

c. Rural ☐

10. Indicate the nature of your leadership position. (Check one.)

a. Principal, in charge of the building ☐

b. Assistant principal ☐

c. Supervisor

1. General-responsible for a number of subjects ☐

2. Special-responsible for a single subject (Please indicate the subject)____________ ☐

d. Department head (Please indicate the subject) ☐

____

e. Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

11. To which of the following local groups did you belong in 1968-69? (Check one.)

a. Local teachers' association ☐

b. Teachers' union local ☐

c. Both the local teachers' association and the union ☐

d. Neither the local teachers' association nor the union ☐

12. With which of the following groups were you affiliated in 1968-69? (Check all that apply to you.)

a. District, regional, or national teachers' union council ☐

b. County teachers' association ☐

c. New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) ☐

d. National Education Association (NEA) ☐

e. None of the above ☐

12A. List any leadership responsibility you have had for each category checked in Item 12. Leadership responsibility includes serving as a member of a committee of a given organization. List only responsibilities during or prior to 1968-69.

____

____

____

____

13. List any professional organization other than teachers' unions or teachers' associations (including NJEA and NEA) to which you belonged in 1968-69, e.g., National Association of School Administrators (NASA). For each organization listed, indicate whether you have been a member only or have held a leadership position.

Organization	Member Only	Leadership Position
____________________	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐
____________________	☐	☐

14. For each organization listed in Item 13, indicate the extent to which you attended meetings during the 1968-69 school year, e.g., the National

Association of School Administrators might have met once during 1968-69; you might have attended that meeting.

Organization	Number of Meetings Held	Number of Meetings Attended
______________________________	☐	☐
______________________________	☐	☐
______________________________	☐	☐
______________________________	☐	☐
______________________________	☐	☐
______________________________	☐	☐

15. List the titles of any professional books which you read during 1968-69. (Exclude books read in conjunction with college courses.)

____

____

____

____

16. List the titles of any professional journals or magazines which you read fairly frequently during 1968-69. (Exclude journals and magazines read in conjunction with college courses.)

____

____

____

____

17. Which of the following best describes what you expect to be doing five years from now? (Check one.)

a. In your same administrative position ☐

b. In a different public school administrative position (Indicate the position)______________________ ☐

c. In a public school teaching position (Indicate the position)______________________ ☐

d. In a non-public school administrative position (Indicate the position)______________________ ☐

e. In a non-public school teaching position (Indicate the position)______________________ ☐

f. Not in educationally related work ☐

18. Which of the following most accurately describes the teaching climate existing in your school in 1968-69? (Check one.)

- a. Teachers are encouraged to try out new ideas in their work - it is expected that they will inform administrators ☐
- b. Teachers are encouraged to try out new ideas in their work - administrators are informed at the teacher's discretion ☐
- c. Teachers are free (but not encouraged by administrators) to try out new ideas in their work - however, administrators expect to be informed ☐
- d. Teachers are free (but not encouraged by administrators) to try out new ideas in their work - administrators are informed at the teacher's discretion ☐
- e. Administrators usually suggest new ideas for teachers to try in their work ☐
- f. Administrators would rather not see teachers try new ideas in their work ☐

19. As nearly as you know, where did the recipient get the idea for the topic of his minigrant project? If more than one applies, check the one source which influenced him most.

- a. The recipient's own thinking ☐
- b. A non-public school professional source
  - 1. Reading professional literature ☐
  - 2. Taking college courses ☐
  - 3. Attending a meeting of a professional organization ☐
  - 4. Other (Please indicate)______________________________ ☐

    ____
- c. A professional in public school work
  - 1. A teacher in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building ☐
  - 2. A teacher in a different field or at a different grade level in the recipient's building ☐
  - 3. A teacher in another building in the recipient's school district ☐
  - 4. A teacher in another school district ☐
  - 5. An administrator or supervisor (including department head) in the recipient's building ☐
  - 6. An administrator in another building in the recipient's school district ☐
  - 7. An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) in the recipient's district ☐

d. A non-professional source
   1. Reading ☐
   2. A school board member ☐
   3. A parent ☐
   4. A student ☐
   5. Other (Please indicate) ______ ☐
      ____

e. You do not know the source of the idea for the topic of the recipient's project ☐

20. Some interests which may have influenced the development of the recipient's project are listed below. Use the numbers one to four to indicate the order in which the interests influenced him. Place the number one in the box of the interest which influenced the recipient the most, the number two in the box of the interest that was next most influential, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

   a. Interest in subject matter content (concepts, skills, etc.) to be taught ☐
   b. Interest in changes in pupils as a result of the project's implementation or use ☐
   c. Interest in the materials and/or the technological equipment used in the project ☐
   d. Interest in developing a new method or technique for the recipient's teaching repertoire ☐

21. If an interest completely different from the four listed in Item 20 above influenced the recipient most in developing his project, please indicate it.______________________________

____

____

22. Who helped the recipient decide to apply for minigrant for his project? If more than one helped, check the one that was most influential.

   a. No one ____
   b. Professionals in public school work
      1. A teacher in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building ☐
      2. A teacher in a different field or at a different grade level in the recipient's building ☐
      3. A teacher in another building in the recipient's school district ☐

4. A teacher in another school district ☐

5. An administrator or supervisor (including department head) in the recipient's building ☐

6. An administrator in another building in the recipient's school district ☐

7. An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

c. Professional educators not in public school work

1. State Department of Education personnel ☐

2. Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐

3. College professor ☐

4. Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

d. Non-professionals

1. School board member ☐

2. Parent ☐

3. Student ☐

4. Other (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

23. Below are some reasons why teachers sought minigrants to obtain financial assistance for their projects. Place the number one in the box following the reason that best applies to the recipient, the number two in the box following the reason that is next most applicable to the recipient, etc. Each box should contain a number from one to five, but any number should not be used more than once.

a. Recipient's confidence in his ability to win a minigrant ☐

b. Feeling by the recipient that his project was so important that it was worth the effort of writing a proposal that might or might not be funded ☐

c. Feeling by the recipient that obtaining a minigrant would provide him with greater professional recognition ☐

d. Feeling by the recipient that applying for a minigrant was what those with whom he works expected of him ☐

e. Feeling by the recipient that a minigrant was a means of getting materials and/or equipment which might be obtained in no other way ☐

24. If a reason completely different from those listed above in Item 23 influenced the recipient most in applying for a minigrant, please indicate it. ____

____

____

25. As the recipient prepared his minigrant proposal for submission to the State Department of Education, with whom did he consult? Check each one consulted. For each one checked, enter one of the four numbers below in the second box to indicate the amount of consultation:

(1) the proposal was largely this person's work

(2) the recipient worked closely with the person in preparing the proposal

(3) the recipient worked occasionally with the person in preparing the proposal

(4) the recipient talked once or twice with the person about the proposal

a. No one was consulted ☐

	Person Consulted	Amount Consultation
b. Professionals in public school work		
1. A teacher in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building	☐	☐
2. A teacher in a different field or at a different grade level in the recipient's building	☐	☐
3. A teacher in another building in the recipient's school district	☐	☐
4. A teacher in another school district	☐	☐
5. An administrator or supervisor (including department head) in the recipient's building	☐	☐
6. An administrator in another building in the recipient's school district	☐	☐
7. An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent)	☐	☐
c. Professional educators not involved in public school work		
1. State Department of Education personnel	☐	☐
2. Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA	☐	☐
3. College professor	☐	☐
4. Other (Please indicate) ______________________________	☐	☐

d. Non-professionals

1. School board member ☐ ☐
2. Parent ☐ ☐
3. Student ☐ ☐
4. Other (Please indicate) ____________________ ☐ ☐

____

26. As the recipient conducted his project, a number of people may have known what he was doing. In the box following each category of persons, indicate the number who knew about the recipient's project in operation. For example, if five teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building knew about the project as it was being implemented, enter the number five in the box following this category. A blank box indicates that as far as you know on one in that category was aware of the project in operation.

	No. of Persons
a. No one knew the recipient's project was going on ☐	
b. Professionals in public school work	
1. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building	☐
2. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building	☐
3. Teachers in another building in the recipient's school district	☐
4. Teachers in another school district	☐
5. Administrators and/or supervisors (including department heads) in the recipient's building	☐
6. Administrators in another building in the recipient's school district	☐
7. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)	☐
c. Professionals not in public school work	
1. State Department of Education personnel	☐
2. Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA	☐
3. College professors	☐
4. Others (Please indicate) ____________________	☐
____________________	
d. Non-professionals	
1. School board members	☐
2. Parents	☐

3. Students ☐

4. Others (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

27. You are probably aware of how others felt about the recipient's project (the nature of what he was trying to do). For each of the groups comprising this item, indicate the consensus of feelings about the project. This is to be done by placing one of the following five numbers in the box after each category that applies. If you are not aware of how a category of persons feels about the project, enter no number in the box.

(1) expressed strong enthusiasm about the project

(2) felt the project was interesting, but did not become overly excited about it

(3) had no strong feelings one way or another about the project

(4) were skeptical about the project, but did not condemn it

(5) expressed strong negative comments about the project

a. Professionals in public school work

1. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building ☐
2. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building ☐
3. Teachers in another building in the recipient's school district ☐
4. Teachers in another school district ☐
5. Administrators and supervisors (including department heads) in the recipient's building ☐
6. Administrators in another building in the recipient's school district ☐
7. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

b. Professional educators not involved in public school work

1. State Department of Education personnel ☐
2. Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐
3. College professors ☐
4. Others (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

c. Non-professionals

1. School board members ☐
2. Parents ☐
3. Students ☐
4. Others (Please indicate)____________________ ☐

____

28. You are probably aware of how others felt regarding the value of minigrant awards as the recipient prepared his proposal and conducted his project. For each of the groups comprising this item, indicate the consensus of the feelings toward the value of minigrant awards. This is to be done by placing one of the following five numbers in the box after each category that applies. If you are not aware of how a category of persons feels about the minigrant awards, enter no number in the box.

(1) expressed strong enthusiasm regarding the value of minigrants

(2) felt minigrants had some value, but were not overly excited about them

(3) had no strong feelings one way or the other about minigrants

(4) were skeptical about the value of minigrants, but did not condemn them

(5) expressed strong negative feelings about the value of minigrants

a. Professionals in public school work

1. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building ☐
2. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building ☐
3. Teachers in another building in the recipient's school district ☐
4. Teachers in another school district ☐
5. Administrators and supervisors (including department heads) in the recipient's building ☐
6. Administrators in another building in the recipient's school district ☐
7. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent) ☐

b. Professional educators not involved in public school work

1. State Department of Education personnel ☐
2. Professional organization personnel, e.g., NJEA ☐

3. College professors ☐

4. Others (Please indicate) ______________________ ☐

____

c. Non-professionals

1. School board members ☐

2. Parents ☐

3. Students ☐

4. Others (Please indicate) ______________________ ☐

____

29. Estimate the number of pupils that have been affected by the recipient's project directly or indirectly. Enter the number of pupils in the box following each appropriate category.

a. Direct effect - the project involved the actual teaching of pupils ☐

b. Indirect effect - the project did not involve the actual teaching of pupils, but the production of material or the development of a technique, for example, which later were used with pupils ☐

c. You have no knowledge of the number of pupils affected by the recipient's project ☐

30. Which of the following best describes the effect of the recipient's project on pupils? (Check one.)

a. There were immediate, observable changes in pupils ☐

b. Only long range changes in pupils can be expected ☐

c. There were immediate, observable changes in pupils, as well as the possibility of long range changes ☐

d. There were no immediate, observable changes in pupils, and long range changes are unlikely ☐

e. The project was not designed to produce changes in pupils ☐

31. Which of the following best describes the nature of the change in pupils' behavior resulting from the recipient's project? (Check one.)

a. Pupils know or understand some subject matter, e.g., facts, concepts, generalizations, etc. ☐

b. Pupils are able to perform some skill, e.g., reading for literal comprehension, batting a ball, etc. ☐

c. Pupils understand some aspect of themselves (or of the behavior of others) ☐

d. Pupils are able to relate more effectively to others ☐

e. Other (Please indicate)________________________________ ☐

____

f. It is not possible to describe the changes in pupil's behavior resulting from the project ☐

g. The project was not designed to produce changes in pupil's behavior ☐

32. Did the recipient's project have any effect on the rate at which pupils learn? (Check one.)

a. Yes - as a result of the project there was a perceptible change in the rate that pupils could do something ☐

b. No - as a result of the project little or no discernible change in the rate that pupils could do something was detected ☐

c. The project was not designed to produce a change in the rate pupils could do something ☐

d. It was not possible to tell whether there was a change in the rate that pupils could do something as a result of the project ☐

33. In the box following each category, estimate the number of teachers who have made use of something from the recipient's project, e.g., subject matter, methods, materials, results, etc. If no teachers have used anything, enter a zero in the box. A blank box will indicate that you do not know whether any teachers in a category have made use of the recipient's project. In the second box following each category evaluate this use by entering the number of one of the following statements.

(1) Most of the teachers indicated have incorporated important aspects of the recipient's project into their own teaching

(2) Most of the teachers indicated have shown as interest in important aspects of the recipient's project, but so far have not used these in their own teaching

(3) Most of the teachers indicated have incorporated unimportant aspects of the recipient's project into their own teaching

(4) Most of the teachers indicated have shown an interest in unimportant aspects of the recipient's project, but so far have not used these in their own teaching

	Number of Teachers	Evaluation of Use
a. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building	☐	☐
b. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building	☐	☐

c. Teachers in another building in the recipient's school district ☐ ☐

d. Teachers in another school district ☐ ☐

34. List the names of teachers in the recipient's building who are using something from his project in their teaching.

____

____

____

35. Which of the following most accurately describes the innovation attempts of teachers in your building? (Check one.)

a. Adoption - teachers use new ideas, techniques, materials, etc. developed by others ☐

b. Adaption - teachers modify ideas, techniques, materials, etc. developed by others to fit their teaching situations ☐

c. Creativity - teachers develop their own ideas, techniques, materials, etc. ☐

d. Teachers do not usually use innovations in their work ☐

36. How have other teachers generally learned about the recipient's project? (Check all responses which represent important means of communication about the project.)

a. Oral means

1. Teachers have contacted the recipient about his project (these teachers have originated requests for information) ☐

2. The recipient has volunteered information about his project through informal contacts with teachers ☐

3. The recipient has described his project to other teachers at formal faculty meetings ☐

4. The recipient has informed other teachers about his project at meetings of professional organizations, e.g., NJEA, International Reading Association (IRA), Association for Supervisory and Curriculum Development (ASCD), etc. ☐

5. Administrative and/or supervisory personnel (including department heads) in the recipient's building have informed teachers about the project ☐

6. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent) have informed teachers about the recipient's project ☐

7. Another teacher has informed teachers about the recipient's project ☐

8. Other oral means (Please indicate) ________________ ☐

____

b. Written means

1. A report of the project written by the recipient has been made available to teachers ☐

2. A report of the project prepared by administrative or supervisory personnel (including department heads) in the recipient's building has been made available to teachers ☐

3. A report of the recipient's project prepared by an administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) has been made available to teachers ☐

4. A report of the recipient's project has appeared in the local press (Indicate the person responsible for this, e.g., you, the recipient, the superintendent, etc.) ________________________________ ☐

5. A report of the recipient's project has appeared in a professional publication, e.g., NJEA Review (Indicate the person writing the article, e.g., you, the recipient, the superintendent, a fellow teacher, etc.) ☐

____

6. Other written means (Please indicate) ______________ ☐

____

____

c. There has been no oral or written dissemination of information about the project ☐

37. What has been the effect of the recipient's project on the board of education in your school district? (Check one.)

a. The board is so impressed with the results of the project it has decided to continue financial support for it and/or similar projects ☐

b. The board has expressed keen interest in the results of the project, but not to the point of any financial commitment to it and/or to similar projects ☐

c. The board has shown mild interest in the results of the project ☐

d. While the board knows about the project, it has not expressed interest one way or the other in the results ☐

e. The board has indicated a basic disinterest in the results of the project ☐

f. The board has expressed strong negative feelings about the results of the project ☐

g. The board seems to know little or nothing about the project ☐

h. You have no knowledge of what the board knows about the project ☐

38. What has been the effect of the recipient's project on parents in your school district? (Check one.)

a. Parents are so deeply impressed with the results of the project that they wish to see it continued or expanded ☐

b. Parents have expressed keen interest in the project, but generally have not indicated a desire to see it continued or expanded ☐

c. Parents have shown mild interest in the project ☐

d. While parents are aware of the project, they have not expressed interest one way or the other in the results ☐

e. Parents have signified a basic disinterest in the results of the project ☐

f. Parents have expressed strong negative feelings about the results of the project ☐

g. Parents seem to know little or nothing about the results of the project ☐

h. You have no knowledge of what parents know about the project ☐

39. How have the board of education and parents learned about the results of the recipient's project? (Check all responses which have served as important means of communicating the project to the board and/or to parents. The first column of boxes concerns the school board, the second column concerns parents.)

	School Board Members	Parents
a. Oral means		
1. Parents and board members contacted the recipient about the results of his project	☐	☐
2. The recipient conveyed information about the results of his project through informal contacts	☐	☐
3. The recipient made formal presentations in which the results of his project were described	☐	☐
4. An administrator or supervisor (including departmen head) in the recipient's building conveyed information about the project	☐	☐
5. An administrator on the central office staff (including the superintendent) provided information about the project	☐	☐
6. Another teacher has reported the results of the project	☐	☐

7. Other oral means (Please indicate) __________ ☐ ☐

____

____

b. Written means

1. The recipient's writing
   (a) An unpublished report ☐ ☐
   (b) A published article ☐ ☐
2. The writing of an administrator or supervisor (including department head) in the recipient's building
   (a) An unpublished report ☐ ☐
   (b) A published article ☐ ☐
3. The writing of an administrator on the central office staff including the superintendent
   (a) An unpublished report ☐ ☐
   (b) A published article ☐ ☐
4. The writing of another teacher
   (a) An unpublished report ☐ ☐
   (b) A published article ☐ ☐
5. An article written by a professional educator not connected with a public school system ☐ ☐
6. A magazine or newspaper article written by a layman ☐ ☐
7. Other written means (Please indicate)_________ ☐ ☐

____

____

c. There has been no oral or written dissemination of information about the recipient's project ☐ ☐

40. Indicate the extent to which there has been an increase in teachers' trying out new ideas in their classes following the implementation of the recipient's project. The following categories of teachers are to be considered:

(1) Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building

(2) Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building

(3) Teachers in other buildings in the recipient's school district

(4) Teachers in other school districts

Every response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of teachers listed above. The number at the top of each of the four columns of boxes corresponds to one of these categories of teachers. Check the box for each category of teachers to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Categories of Teachers (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. There has been a marked increase in teachers' trying out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Teachers have shown a marked increase in interest in trying out new ideas without actually doing so	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. There has been a mild increase in teachers' trying out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Teachers have shown a mild increase in trying out new ideas without actually doing so	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. There has been no change in teacher interest in trying out new ideas or in their attempts to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There has been a decline in teacher interest in trying out new ideas or in their attempts to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. You have no knowledge of teacher interest in trying out new ideas or their attempts to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐

41. Indicate the degree to which teachers tried out new ideas in their work prior to the initiation of the recipient's project. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently

(2) Sometimes

(3) Seldom or never

Each category of teacher is followed by three boxes. For each category, check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom or Never
a. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building	☐	☐	☐
b. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building	☐	☐	☐
c. Teachers in other buildings in the recipient's school district	☐	☐	☐

d. Teachers in other school districts ☐ ☐ ☐

42. Indicate the extent to which the recipient's project has influenced administrator thinking regarding teachers' trying out new ideas in the classroom. The following categories of administrators are to be considered:

(1) Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in the recipient's building

(2) Administrators in other buildings in the recipient's school district

(3) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)

(4) Administrators in other school districts

Every response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of administrators listed above. The number at the top of each of the four columns of boxes corresponds to one of these categories of administrators. Check the box for each category of administrators to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Categories of Administrators			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. There has been a marked increase in administrators' attempts to get teachers to try out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators have shown a marked increase in interest in having teachers try out new ideas without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. There has been a mild increase in administrators' attempts to get teachers to try out new ideas in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators have shown a mild increase in interest in having teachers try out new ideas without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. There has been no change in administrator interest in trying out new ideas in teaching or in their attempts to get teachers to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There has been a decline in administrator interest in teachers' trying out new ideas in teaching or in their attempts to get teachers to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. You have no knowledge of administrator interest in teachers' trying out new ideas in teaching or in their attempts to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐

43. Indicate the degree to which administrators encouraged teachers to try out new ideas in their work prior to the initiation of the recipient's project. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently

(2) Sometimes

(3) Seldom or never

Each category of administrators is followed by three boxes. For each category, check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom or Never
a. Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in the recipient's building	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators in other buildings in the recipient's school district	☐	☐	☐
c. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators in other school districts	☐	☐	☐

44. Indicate the extent the recipient's obtaining a minigrant increased teacher interest in applying for minigrants. The following categories of teachers are to be considered:

(1) Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building

(2) Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building

(3) Teachers in other buildings in the recipient's school district

(4) Teachers in other school districts

Every response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of teachers listed above. The number at the top of each of the four columns of boxes corresponds to one of the categories of teachers. Check the box for each category of teachers to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Categories of Teachers			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. The recipient's obtaining a minigrant has been followed by other teachers writing proposals which they plan to submit to the State Department of Education	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. After the recipient obtained a minigrant, teachers expressed strong interest in writing proposals, but so far have not done so	☐	☐	☐	☐

c. After the recipient obtained a minigrant, teachers expressed mild interest in writing proposals	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. After the recipient obtained a minigrant, there was little or no increase in teacher interest in writing proposals	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. After the recipient obtained a minigrant, there was a decrease in teacher interest in writing proposals	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. You have no knowledge of teacher interest in applying for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐

45. Indicate the extent of teacher interest in applying for minigrants prior to the funding of the recipient's proposal. Use the following ratings:

(1) High
(2) Medium
(3) Low

Each category of teachers is followed by three boxes. For each category check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	High	Medium	Low
a. Teachers in the same field or at the same grade level in the recipient's building	☐	☐	☐
b. Teachers in different fields or at different grade levels in the recipient's building	☐	☐	☐
c. Teachers in other buildings in the recipient's school district	☐	☐	☐
d. Teachers in other school districts	☐	☐	☐

46. Indicate the extent the recipient's obtaining a minigrant has influenced administrator interest in encouraging teachers to write proposals. The following categories of administrators are to be used:

(1) Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in the recipient's building
(2) Administrators in other buildings in the recipient's school district
(3) Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent
(4) Administrators in other school systems

Each response is followed by four boxes, one for each of the four categories of administrators listed above. The number at the top of each of the four columns of boxes corresponds to one of these categories of administrators. Check the box for each category of administrators to which a response applies. Each column of boxes should include only one box that is checked.

	Categories of Administrators (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
a. There has been a marked increase in administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators have shown a marked increase in interest in having teachers apply for minigrants without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. There has been a mild increase in administrators efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators have shown a mild increase in interest in having teachers apply for minigrants without actually encouraging them to do so	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. There has been no change in administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. There has been a decline in administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. You have no knowledge of administrator efforts to encourage teachers to apply for minigrants	☐	☐	☐	☐

47. Indicate the extent to which administrators encouraged teachers to apply for minigrants prior to the funding of the recipient's proposal. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently

(2) Sometimes

(3) Seldom or never

Each category of administrators is followed by three boxes. For each category, check the box representing the appropriate rating. If you have no knowledge regarding a particular category, so indicate by leaving the three boxes blank.

	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom or Never
a. Administrators (including supervisors and department heads) in the recipient's building	☐	☐	☐
b. Administrators in other buildings in the recipient's school district	☐	☐	☐
c. Administrators on the central office staff (including the superintendent)	☐	☐	☐
d. Administrators in other school districts	☐	☐	☐

48. Indicate the extent the recipient has changed with respect to each of the behaviors listed below since receiving a minigrant. The following ratings are to be used:

(1) Increase greatly
(2) Some increase
(3) No change
(4) Some decline
(5) Declined greatly

If you have no knowledge about a category, so indicate by leaving the boxes blank.

	Increased Greatly	Some Increase	No Change	Some Decline	Declined Greatly
a. Contacts with teachers					
1. Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Formal, e.g., speaking to groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Contacts with administrators					
1. Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Formal, e.g., speaking to groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Contacts with school board members					
1. Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Formal, e.g., speaking at board meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Contacts with parents					
1. Informal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Formal, e.g., speaking to groups such as the PTA	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Reading professional literature	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Membership in professional organization	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Leadership in professional organization	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Attending professional meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Trying out new ideas in teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

49. If there have been changes in the recipient's professional behavior after receiving a minigrant, describe important instances of these changes. Please be specific in the examples you give.

a. Instances of changes in professional behavior

____

____

____

____

____

____

b. There has been no change in the recipient's professional behavior after obtaining a minigrant ☐

c. There has been a decline in the recipient's professional behavior after obtaining a minigrant ☐

50. The following represent some ways that teaching might be varied. Indicate the extent which the recipient used each prior to applying for a minigrant. Use the following ratings:

(1) Frequently - 10 or more times per year

(2) Sometimes - 3 to 9 times per year

(3) Almost never - 2 or fewer times per year

	Frequently	Sometimes	Almost Never
a. Introducing new and/or unique content (concepts, skills, etc.) into the teaching program	☐	☐	☐
b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching	☐	☐	☐
c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching	☐	☐	☐

51. Give some examples of ways the recipient has varied his teaching to support your responses to Item 50.

____

____

____

____

____

____

52. Some activities performed by teachers are listed below. Use the numbers one of seven to indicate the order of interest of these activities to the minigrant recipient. Place the number one in the box of the activity that the recipient prefers to do most, the number two in the box of the activity that is of next greatest interest to him, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Helping a shy pupil relate more effectively to other youngsters ☐

b. Presenting a concept to a group of youngsters ☐

c. Preparing learning materials for pupils ☐

d. Deciding what should be taught to a group of pupils ☐

e. Determining what weaknesses given pupils have in a subject field ☐

f. Working with an individual pupil to correct a particular deficiency ☐

g. Determining the effects to a particular teaching strategy on pupils ☐

53. Below are some ways to teach. Use the numbers one to seven to indicate the order in which the minigrant recipient uses them in his own work. Place the number one in the box of the way the recipient uses most frequently, the number two in the box of the way he uses next most frequently, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers with whom the recipient talks or whom he observes ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using the recipient's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching in ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

54. Rank the ways of teaching in the order that you prefer teachers to use in their work. Enter the number one in the box of the way you feel should be used first and foremost, the number two in the box of the way next most preferred, etc. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using one's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching in ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

55. Rank the ways of teaching in the order of their importance to school board members.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using one's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching in ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

56. Rank the ways of teaching in the order of their importance to parents.

a. Teaching according to ways suggested by administrators and supervisors ☐

b. Teaching in ways used by superior teachers ☐

c. Teaching in ways suggested by textbook manuals and/or other curriculum guides ☐

d. Teaching using one's own ideas regarding what needs to be taught and how to teach it ☐

e. Teaching in ways stressed in teacher education courses in college ☐

f. Teaching in ways pupils enjoy most ☐

g. Teaching content and using techniques favored by parents in the community ☐

57. Below are listed some ways which a teacher might use to vary his teaching. Use the numbers one to three to indicate the order of importance of these ways to you. Enter the number one in the box of the way you feel is most important for teachers to use, the number two in the box of the way that is next most important for teachers to use, and the number three in the box of the way that is least important for teachers to use. No number is to be used more than once.

a. Introducing new content (concepts, skills, etc.) into teaching ☐

b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching ☐

c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching ☐

58. Rank the ways of varying teaching in the order of their importance to school board members.

- a. Introducing new content (concepts, skills, etc.) into teaching ☐
- b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching ☐
- c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching ☐

59. Rank the ways of varying teaching in order of their importance to parents.

- a. Introducing new content (concepts, skills, etc.) into teaching ☐
- b. Trying new methods and techniques of teaching ☐
- c. Using different materials and/or technology in teaching ☐

60. What has the recipient's obtaining a minigrant meant to you? Use the space below for your response. Attach additional sheets, if necessary.

Name ______________________________

Position ______________________________

School District ______________________________

Date ______________________________

APPENDIX 2

Brief Descriptions of the Innovative Projects of the 1968-69 Minigrant Recipients Participating in the Study

Minigrant Projects

The descriptions of the minigrant projects in Appendix 2 were prepared by Constance I. Messerley and appeared initially in Minigrants: A Report on the First Year of the Teacher Innovation Program published in October 1969 by the New Jersey State Department of Education.

ATLANTIC COUNTY

1. **Atlantic City**

   Special Education

   Establishment of a school store

BERGEN COUNTY

2. **Hackensack**

   Counseling; grade 3

   The employment of a black male high school student to act as an aide and tutor for a third grade class

3. **Mahwah**

   Language Arts - general; grade 9

   Development and production of cards with prefixes, roots and suffixes for a rummy-type word game

4. **Palisades Park**

   Language Arts - formal English; high school

   A study of commercial television, including topics such as economics, history, psychology and law

5. **Pascack Valley Regional**

   Mathematics; high school

   Initiation of field math, in which students go out in the field to solve "live" math problems with class constructed instruments

6. **Ridgewood**

   Physical Education; elementary

   The solution of a space problem through the use of mats and equipment in halls and "commons" area

7. **Ridgewood**

   Language Arts - general; grade 2

   Construction of a machine for developing correct sentence construction and intonation

BERGEN COUNTY (contd.)

8. Ridgewood

Social Studies - general; high school

A group of high school students to meet for a semester and plan the curriculum for a poverty, urban and racial relations course

9. Oradell-River Edge Regional

Social Studies - Government

A small group of students takes a trip to Trenton to learn about State Government politics

10. River Vale

Special Education

Video tape classroom activities to modify behavior through immediate feedback

11. Tenafly

Health; elementary

To complete and refine a new curriculum in sex education

12. Waldwick

Social Studies - History; high school

An audio-visual, student participative approach to history for the non-college-bound student

13. Bergen County Vocational and Technical High School

Vocational Education; high school

Use of photography to teach auto-related science and auto-mechanics

BURLINGTON COUNTY

14. Chesterfield Township

Science - Physics; elementary

A project to study and build a rocket

BURLINGTON COUNTY (contd.)

15. Cinnaminson Township

Language Arts - general; grades 7-9

Production of films to teach basic semantic principles

16. Eastampton Township

Language Arts - general; grades K-1

Use of Richard Weber's method (MUSICALL) in which abstract symbols are applied to concrete experience to teach reading

17. Lenape Regional

Counseling; high school

Small group counseling for the pre-addict drug user

18. Maple Shade Township

Language Arts - general; grade 1

Construction of head-set listening stations

19. Moorestown

Mathematics; grades 5 and 6

Enrichment in measurement-science

20. Willingboro Township

Fine Arts - Music

Production of video tapes on how to teach elementary choral and vocal music, dealing especially with the problem of the unchanged or immature voice

21. Willingboro Township

Science - general; kindergarten

Production of video tape science lessons that encourage active participation by the viewers

CAMDEN COUNTY

22. **Bellmawr**

Fine Arts - Music; elementary

Learning to play the harmonica in order to improve speech, listening and breathing

23. **Berlin**

Language Arts - general; elementary

Construction of a listening center in the classroom

24. **Cherry Hill Township**

Language Arts - general; elementary

Improvement in reading through enriched experiences, discussions of them and writings about them

25. **Gloucester City**

Language Arts - general; grade 1

Use of student-made acetate overheads to provide immediate feedback and encourage readiness

26. **Winslow Township**

General enrichment; kindergarten

Division of the room into subject areas with additional equipment in each

CAPE MAY COUNTY

27. **Woodbine**

Science - Earth Science; grade 8

A study of weather

28. **Woodbine**

Language Arts - English as a second language; grade 1

Purchase of toys for half Spanish-speaking class to establish a more comfortable atmosphere

ESSEX COUNTY

29. Essex Fells

Science - general; grade 2

Conversion of a section of the classroom into a science lab and the taping of directions for science projects

30. Glen Ridge

Social Studies - general

Improve the reading skills and study habits of slow-learning seventh graders through the use of student-developed audio-visual materials

31. Newark

General enrichment; grade 1

Improve self-image and racial pride through a general enrichment program of trips and lectures by black leaders and compilation of a photographic yearbook

32. Newark

Special Education

Construction of special speech booth for deaf children

33. Newark

Social Studies - general; elementary

Development of an Afro-American history curriculum, review of available audio-visual materials, and in-service training of teachers

GLOUCESTER COUNTY

34. Deptford Township

Language Arts - general; elementary

Improvement in reading skills through motivational training and the use of the Educational Development Laboratories Reading System

GLOUCESTER COUNTY (contd.)

35. Glassboro

Language Arts - Drama

Production of video tapes to instruct teachers in the use of puppetry

36. Mantua

Language Arts - general; elementary

Purchase of more equipment for a television show produced by an elementary class and shown throughout the school

37. West Deptford Township

Language Arts - Formal English; grade 9

Use of films to enrich the study of literature

HUDSON COUNTY

38. Bayonne

Vocational Education

Teaching how to use electronic calculators by taped lectures

39. Jersey City

Social Studies - general; elementary

Revision of elementary curriculum through teacher meetings and review of materials, to incorporate black studies into regular curriculum

HUNTERDON COUNTY

40. Flemington-Raritan Regional

Library; elementary

Purchase of science equipment to be available for students to borrow and take hom

MERCER COUNTY

41. Ewing Township

Science - general; junior high

Evaluation of the use of audio-tutorials for science classes

42. Hopewell Valley Regional

Language Arts - general; grade 1

Construction of a listening center so that tape recorders can be used more easily

43. Lawrence Township

Social Studies - Government; high school

Production of video tapes of local government agencies

44. Lawrence Township

Science - Physics; high school

A comprehensive course in aviation

45. Trenton

Industrial Arts; high school

A research project to compare the results of teaching mechanical drawing by the traditional and by the "enriched" method

46. Trenton

Counseling

Group counseling sessions with students, teachers and parents and discussions of black and Puerto Rican culture to improve the student's self image

47. Trenton

Fine Arts - visual arts; high school

Research by teacher on the role of the Afro-American in the arts

MERCER COUNTY (contd.)

48. Marie H. Katzenbach School

Special Education

Construction of audio-visual study area

MIDDLESEX COUNTY

49. East Brunswick

General enrichment; grades 7-9

Establishment of an independent study program

50. Highland Park

Humanities; grades 7 and 8

Development of ungraded self-selecting units in specific topics in the humanities

51. Madison Township

Language Arts - Drama; grade 3

Use of dramatics in teaching reading skills

52. New Brunswick

Fine Arts - Music; elementary

Use of the Orff-Kodaly method (which emphasizes rythm and non-intellectualism) to teach music to the disadvantaged child

53. New Brunswick

Fine Arts - Music; elementary

Purchase of instruments developed by Carl Orff

54. Sayreville

Mathematics; grade 7

Purchase of calculators for slow learning math students

MIDDLESEX COUNTY (contd.)

55. South Brunswick

Science - Biology; high school

Construction of an outdoor education area

56. Woodbridge Township

Mathematics; elementary

Development of an "environmental math" curriculum for all elementary grades (this included the use of games and other equipment which makes the student aware that math is applicable to his everyday life)

MONMOUTH COUNTY

57. Colts Neck Township

Language Arts - general; grade 4

Use of the typewriter to improve the reading skills of under-achieving males

58. Rumson-Fair Haven Regional

General enrichment; high school

Study, buy, catalogue and produce educational games

MORRIS COUNTY

59. Butler

Science - Physics; high school

A study of atomic energy through individual research projects using the Gammator 50B

60. Chatham Borough

Mathematics; high school

A study of computers through the installation and three months' use of a computer terminal

61. Parsippany-Troy Hills Township

General enrichment; high school

Initiation of independent student research projects in all subjects, utilizing modern research equipment (computers, calculators, etc.)

MORRIS COUNTY (contd.)

62. Parsippany-Troy Hills Township

Social Studies - general; elementary

Development and implementation of a curriculum in "human relations" and racial attitudes using audio-visual materials, trips, lectures, exchanges and socio-dramas

63. Roxbury Township

Tutoring; elementary

The use of well qualified high school students to act as tutors in science for elementary students

OCEAN COUNTY

64. Southern Regional High School

Mathematics; grades 7 and 8

The production of tachistoscopic filmstrips on arithmetic problems

PASSAIC COUNTY

65. Clifton

Science - Biology; high school

Expansion of the outdoor education area

66. Paterson

Language Arts - English as a second language; adult education

Teaching English to Spanish-speaking parents through a sensory approach

67. Paterson

Social Studies - general; grade 4

A study of current events and the news media

SALEM COUNTY

68. Salem

Fine Arts - Music; kindergarten and grade 1

A study of the concept of rhythm with the production of video tapes of rhythms in nature, industry and art

SALEM COUNTY (contd.)

69. Salem

Language Arts - Drama; grade 7

Produce plays to motivate students to read

SOMERSET COUNTY

70. Franklin Township

Mathematics; high school

Purchase of calculators for slow-learning math students

71. Somerville

Science - general; high school

Teach high school students how to use lab equipment by tapes and slides

72. Somerset County Vocational

Vocational Education; high school

A project initiated and planned by students to build a demonstration "training" unit illustrating the basic refrigeration cycle

SUSSEX COUNTY

73. High Point Regional

Language Arts - general; grade 10

Improvement of "improper" oral and written English by imitation of correct speech (using tapes, records, filmstrips and other audio-visual materials)

74. Sparta Township

General enrichment; grade 4

Fourth grade class to study films and make one

75. Sparta Township

Science - general; elementary

A comprehensive study of aviation through plastic models, balloons, simulating flying, field trips, etc.

UNION COUNTY

76. **Elizabeth**

Science - Earth Science; grade 6

Study of weather --especially air currents-- and forecasting

77. **Elizabeth**

Language Arts - general; junior high

Use of the typewriter as a motivational device

78. **Kenilworth**

Language Arts - Formal English; grades 7 and 8

Intensive work in creative writing for seventh and eighth graders

79. **Mountainside**

General - Curriculum development; grade 5

Study the available audio-visual material for fifth grade and prepare study questions to stimulate students to use the material

80. **Plainfield**

Library; elementary

The purchase of portable film strip projectors which can be taken home by students

81. **Springfield**

Language Arts - general; kindergarten

Construction of carrels for individualized work with records, film strips, etc. in an attempt to develop reading readiness skills

82. **Springfield**

Counseling; elementary

Improvement of student's self-image by video taping his improvisations and then replaying the tape for immediate feedback

UNION COUNTY (contd.)

83. Springfield

Social Studies - general; grade 8

An attempt to improve racial understanding through exchange visits between suburban and urban junior high classes and visits to various ethnic neighborhoods

84. Union

Science - Physics; high school

Production of tapes and slides on individual physics problems

85. Union

Science - general; elementary

Use of laboratory equipment and manipulative materials to teach elementary level science

86. Westfield

Language Arts - general; grades 1 and 2

Construction of an audio-visual lab to be kept in the classroom and used individually by students with reading difficulties